

The Review of English Studies

VOL. XIII.—No. 50.

APRIL, 1937.

NEW LIGHT ON THE LIFE OF GEORGE GASCOIGNE

BY GENEVIEVE AMBROSE OLDFIELD

ALTHOUGH many facts in the life of the Elizabethan poet George Gascoigne are obscured by the lapse of time and disputed by his biographers, it is my intention to consider now only two of these matters, *i.e.* (1) the so-called "disinheritance theory," which presupposes that Gascoigne was legally disinherited before his father's death; and (2) the poet's marriage, which long has been enshrouded in mystery and which still presents its baffling points.

First of all, in considering the disinheritance theory, the poet's own words should have some weight in the matter, though, unsupported by other proof, they would avail but little. However, it is as well at least to glance at his prose preambles and the prose introductions to his poems. In these prefatory remarks, which are cast in the form of letters, his attitude should be sincere, and in all of them one notices that he often refers to his misspent youth. For instance, in his "Epistle to the Reverend Divines,"¹ written in 1574, he writes "whatsoever my youth hath seemed unto the graver sort, I woulde bee verie loth nowe in my middle age to deserve reproch. . . . For if I shoulde nowe at this age seeme as carelesse of reproche, as I was in greene youth readie to goe astray, my faultes might quickly growe double, and myne estimation shoulde bee woorthie too remayne but single." Later in the same he refers

¹ Used as introduction to the second edition of his works, appearing in 1575 under the title *The Posies*.

to the "oversight of my youth" which "had brought me far behind hand and indebted unto the world."

Again the following year, in an "Epistle to the Young Gentlemen of England,"¹ in apologizing for his poems he attests that "a man of middle yeares, who hath to his cost experimented the vanities of youth, and to his perill passed them: who hath bought repentance deare, and yet gone through with the bargaine: who seeth before his face the tyme past lost, and the rest passing away in post: Such a man had more neede to be well advised in his doings, and resolute in his determinations. For with more ease and greater favour may we answer for tenn madde follies committed in grene youth, than one sober oversight escaped in yeares of discretion." And of his poems he says, "for the most of them being written in my madnesse, might have yeelded then more delight to my frantike fansie to see them published, than they now do accumulate cares in my minde to set them forth corrected: and a deformed youth had bene more likely to set them to sale long sithence than a reformed man can be able now to protect them with simplicitie." And later, "being indebted unto the world (at the least five thousand days very vainly spent) I may yeeld him yet some part of mine account in these Poemes."

And, again, to account for publishing his poems, he states "because I have (to mine owne great detriment) mispent my golden time, I may serve as ensample to the youthfull Gentlemen of England, that they runne not upon the rocks which have brought me to shipwracke." He adjures his readers to "beware . . . and learn you to use the talent which I have highly abused. Make me your mirrour. And if hereafter you see me recover mine estate, or re-edify the decayed walls of my youth, then begin you sooner to build some foundation which may beautify your pallace."

Once more, in "The general advertisement" of his poems "to the reader,"² the following passage is suggestive of the same regret or disappointment: "yet wit and I did (in youth) make such a fray, that I fear his cozen wisdom will never become friends with me in my age." He excuses himself with these words, "Well though my folly be greater than my fortune, yet overgreat were mine uncon-
stancy if in mine own behalf I should compile so many sundry songs

¹ Also included in introduction of the second edition of his collected poems, 1575.

² Prefatory to second edition.

or sonnets." "For," says he, "in wanton delights I helped all men, though in sad earnest I never furthered myself any kind of way."

All these references and innuendoes surely at least bespeak some serious thought in the poet's mind, something that might well have been otherwise.

To include as evidence autobiographical material gleaned from his poems would perhaps be treading on dangerous ground, since it has been claimed recently that Gascoigne's *Hundreth Sundry Flowres*¹ is but an anthology of verses written by various poets of the period,² so the evidence of his verses will be left until later. But even if the author himself cannot be relied upon for facts concerning his own life, it would seem indeed strange if a contemporary and friend during his lifetime should feel called upon to write untrue things of the poet's life immediately after his death. And yet Arber's reprint of the Stationers' Register for the year 1577 contains the entry, under the name of Aggas: "Licenced unto him a Remembraunce of the well employed lief and godlie ende of George Gascoign esquier who deceased at Stamford in Lincolnshire the vij of October, 1577, the reporte of George Whetstons gentleman." It will be realized that George Whetstone was really a friend, for it was at his home in Stamford that Gascoigne died in the presence of his wife and son, and was buried in the family vault of the Whetstones.

The pamphlet containing the "reporte" (Malone 593, in the Bodleian) is in verse and tells of the life and death of the poet. It is written partly in the first person, as though Gascoigne himself were the writer, and between the verses are interspersed several interesting annotations in prose, as though Whetstone had added these, such as "He was Sir John Gascoigne's sonne and heire disinherited," and "he thought he could succeed despite his disinheritance." It does not seem probable that at such a time a

¹ This is the title of the first edition of Gascoigne's collected works published in 1572/3.

² The anthology theory is repudiated by the present writer, who bases her belief, among other things, on the fact that the so-called anthology, reprinted by the Haslewood Press for Mr. B. M. Ward in 1926, contains only half the original volume, which is divided by a break in pagination at p. 201. The latter half is called the original first edition by Mr. Ward, despite the fact that of the six known copies of this volume none contains only this portion without the first part consisting of the two plays, "The Supposes" and "Jocasta," both of which are referred to by the Printer in his foreword "to the Reader" occurring in the first edition of Gascoigne's poems.

friend would make false statements about the poet's disinherittance if some such thing had not occurred. But to turn to more authoritative proof in the legal documents.

As early as June 1, 1562, Sir John had disposed of the capital house and site of his manor of Cardington with appurtenances, by "sale, bargaine, enfeofment,"¹ etc., of the same to Edward Gilbert, alderman of London, after having recovered the same to the use of himself and wife "and their heirs forever" from Francis Earl of Bedford and Sir George Conyers, less than a month previously on May 12, 1562.² And in both these documents the name of his son and heir do not occur, though in similar documents "his son and heir, George" together with the father, are named as party of the one part, especially in deeds pertaining to property.

However, one would pass by this fact most innocently if Sir John Gascoigne's will³ did not very clearly indicate that the relation between himself and his son George was far from harmonious. The will was made on April 2, 1568, two days before Sir John died. In it he left to his wife household effects to the value of 300 marks, to be appraised by "four indifferent persons," according to the terms and meaning of a promise conveyed in a pair of indentures between Francis, Earl of Bedford and Sir George Conyers on the one part, and himself and son, George, on the other part, with his wife to have her choice of the goods. Other bequests followed, including the lease of the parsonage of Fenlake Barnes in Cardington to his younger son, John. And all his manors, lands, etc., not before granted he left to his son George and his heirs, "upon one condition only, and not otherwise," that his executor should be allowed to take sufficient of the profits therefrom to satisfy all debts, legacies and bequests as set forth in the will, including one annuity of £20 for life to a servant, Anne Drewry.⁴ Or, alternatively, he ordained that his son, George, should discharge the terms of the will within one year of his father's death, and if this were not done all his lands, tenements, etc., not included in his wife's jointure and £16 *per annum* out of the profits

¹ Public Record Office, Patent Roll, 4 Elizabeth, Part 10, mem. 30 (29).

² P.R.O., Patent Roll, 5 Elizabeth, Part 10, mem. 3 (56).

³ P.C.C., Babington 12, preserved in Somerset House, London.

⁴ This is the Anne Drewrie who appeared in the Queen's Court on January 23, 1585, and pleaded herself satisfied with the "outlawry" of Sir John Gascoigne, who had been imprisoned for refusing to pay her the sum of £200, with 68s. damages, awarded her previously in the same Court. The Queen therefore, "in her piety" pardoned Sir John his "outlawry" and he was forthwith released from prison. P.R.O., Patent Roll, 7 Elizabeth, Part 8, mem. 1 (45).

of her jointure, were to go to Sir John's executor to enable him to carry out the terms of the will, including also the payment of funeral charges, etc. A list of the debts followed, including a recognizance in which George was implicated and would suffer.

This recognizance¹ was made on November 12, 1567, only five months before the will was drawn up, and consisted of a pair of indentures between Sir John Gascoigne and his son, George, on the one part, and one Thomas Colby of London on the other part, and discloses the fact that the latter paid to the former the sum of £940 for the manor of "Escottes, *alias* Cotton," in Cardington, with all its appurtenances, farms, lands, etc., except several leases of land not yet expired, which were to run until expiry with the profits reserved to Sir John and his heirs.

Then on the security of this recognizance Sir John alone, without reference to his son, accepted from Thomas Colby on December 15 next following the sum of 2,000 marks and again on March 10, 1568, another £200, both of which amounts were to be returned only if the terms of the original recognizance were not kept. Three weeks and two days later, when Sir John made his will—only two days before he died—the terms of the recognizance apparently were still troubling his mind. Probably he feared that his son George would attempt to forfeit the pledge he had made with his father regarding Thomas Colby's "possession and enjoyment of the property unmolested" by claims, for he stipulated that his executor should take whatever steps might be necessary to prevent such forfeiture of the recognizance, even to "the prosecuting and serving of execution of a bond" against his son.

This left matters so that George, if he had wished to recover the premises involved, not only would have had to repay the original sum of £940 received from Colby for the manor and appurtenances, but also the additional 2,000 marks and £200 advanced to his father by Colby. And Sir John in his will, to further ensure that all the tangle was carried out, appointed this same Thomas Colby supervisor of his will, to confer with and advise the executor. And if his executor, a nephew through his wife's connections, William Curson, refused to act as executor, Thomas Colby should assume that office as well.

In this manner, with his property all tied up or disposed of, except that which was apportioned to his wife and his younger son,

¹ P.R.O., Patent Roll, 10 Elizabeth, Part 11, and Close Roll, Part 13.

Sir John practically disinherited his son and heir, George, without publicly announcing the fact, though if the Inquisition Post Mortem¹ can be relied upon for accuracy, and it was taken April 2, 1569, long enough after Sir John's death for the matter to have become obscured and misrepresented, George did acquire a "manor and fourth part of the barony and other premises" which were worth by the year £20 14s. 11d. and 12s. respectively. However, in view of subsequent events, it does not seem likely in this instance that the Inquisition Post Mortem can be strictly relied upon.

The first question that arises is why Sir John chose this manner of disinheriting his son when he might as easily have publicly announced the disinheritance if the son had displeased or disgraced his father. The answer to this question is not far to seek. On July 10, 1563, only nine months after the marriage of George to Elizabeth Breton, Sir John appeared in the Queen's Chancery Court² and acknowledged that he owed his son George £1,000 if the property due to descend to him and his heirs were otherwise disposed of, except to descend to the rightful heirs of Sir John in case George lacked issue. But Sir John, rather than fulfil the terms of this recognizance and pay his son £1,000 for the inheritance which he was not to receive, preferred to dispose of the bulk of the estate through the recognizance for Thomas Colby of London, and even had the audacity to secure his son's connivance in the plan. It was a bold enterprise and apparently succeeded, for his son's verdict was recorded in Whetstone's "Remembrance":

First of my life, which some (amis) did knowe,
I leve mine armes, my actes shall blase the same,
Yet on a thorne a grape will never growe,
No more a Churle, dooth breed a childe of fame.
But (for my birth) my birth right was not great
My father did his forward son defeat.

This froward deed could scarce my hart dismay . . .

So, apparently, he understood the cause of his father's bitterness that resulted so woefully for him. And later he was to feel the echo of the "froward deed," when his mother, Lady Margaret, whose will was made on April 16, 1574, did not even mention George, though she left property and money to her younger son, John Gascoigne. But George was better placed then and dared to dispute her will. On the same day that it was proved, March 10, 1575, George

¹ P.R.O., Chancery Inquisition, Post Mortem, Series II, vol. 151, (3).

² P.R.O., Close Roll, 5 Elizabeth, Part 21.

attempted to have it broken legally,¹ but this was not accomplished. Her executor, John Conyers—a nephew—carried out the provisions of the will, sentence definitive was passed on the lady's sanity and her son George, for his trouble, only incurred the expenses involved.

Now what could have caused such bitterness, such animosity, such retaliation on the part of the father, Sir John Gascoigne, that his son George would feel it for the rest of his life? In the first place he deserted the law for a Court life, though it is true that later he returned to Gray's Inn to practise law. But surely this would not cause a father to disinherit his son. George was a bold courtier; he envied those higher placed and aspired to service for the Queen. His ambition knew no bounds, and neither—we surmise—did his prodigality and extravagance. A "young blood" of Elizabeth's age usually lived a fast, quick, and short life, and evidence is not lacking that George did all three of these superlatively, which may not have pleased even an Elizabethan father. But in addition to incurring enormous debts, squandering his time, his money, brains, and health, he made a marriage under circumstances which probably added the last drop to his father's cup of bitterness.

Within the very year of this marriage, possibly acting under coercion of his son, who wanted to be assured of his future inheritance from a father who had already perhaps very patently expressed his opinion of his son's wife, Sir John made the promise in the Chancery Court that he would forfeit £1,000 to George if the lands, manors, etc., were not allowed to descend to him and his heirs;² but how easily Sir John circumvented this promise!

The marriage of the poet, George, to Elisabeth, widow of William Breton and daughter of John Bacon of Bury St. Edmunds, was celebrated at Christ Church, Newgate Street, on November 23, 1562, according to the Church Register of Christenings, Marriages and Burials from 1538 to 1588.³

Now William Breton in his will, dated February 12, 1557,

¹ P.C.C., Carew 4, preserved in Somerset House, London.

² P.R.O., Close Roll, 5 Elizabeth, Part 21, No. 98.

³ In the list of marriages, however, the year 1538 in the original—which was written in 1586, evidently a transcript of an earlier register—has been altered by a later hand to 1542, with a corresponding alteration in subsequent years until 1587. And the Harleian Society, by whom the registers were published in 1895, adhered to the years as altered in the original. If the date had not been altered the marriage of Gascoigne to Elisabeth must have occurred on November 23, 1558; but her first husband, William Breton, did not die until January 12, 1559, so 1558 is untenable.

⁴ Taken from the Memorial Introduction to Rev. Alexander B. Grosart's *Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Nicholas Breton*, London, 1879, pp. xii-xvii.

expressed his confidence in his wife, for he left to her his capital mansion in St. Giles parish without Creplegate, as well as property and houses in Barbycan and Redcross Streets in the same parish, and also his quay and wharf called "Dyse Key" which he had bought of Thomas Bacon and then let to the same Thomas and James Bacon, his brother, to the use of Elisabeth during her life, and after her death to the use of his eldest son, Richard. But in his bequests to his sons, Richard and Nicholas, and to his daughters, all of which he left in the custody of his wife until they attained their majorities, he took the further precaution of providing in the event of her remarriage, in which case, or, if she died before the bequests were made, he ordained that his father-in-law John Bacon and Lawrence Eresby, or the longer liver of them, should assume the custody of and dispose of their profits to the good up-bringing of the children. He must have been motivated therefore by some suspicion that if his wife remarried the custody of his children's heritage might be better left in other hands. He died on January 12, 1559, and his father-in-law, John Bacon of Bury St. Edmunds,¹ did not long survive him. His will was made on April 7, 1559, and proved on March 10, 1560.² When the will was made his daughter was already remarried and, we assume, not quite to his liking, since he left to her, whom throughout the will he designated as "Boysse," only one-third of a gold chain which was to be equally divided between his three daughters, whereas to his other two unmarried daughters he left money and property as well. The will also mentions his son-in-law, "Mr. Boyse," to whom he left gold for a ring.

The will of James Bacon of London³ was dated April 22, 1573, and mentions the quay called "Dice Keye," in the parish of St. Dunstan in the East, "late purchased of Richard Britein" for the sum of £900, "whereof £450 is already paid, and £450 is due after the death of Elizabeth Gascoyne, mother of the said Richard Britteine, and to her for life there is to be paid £50 a year." He also ordained that £450 should be realized of his goods, etc., to remain in the hands of his wife for the discharge of his "heir," after the death

¹ Up to this time it has been impossible to substantiate the statement frequently made that her father was one John Bacon of London. If such were the case this second John Bacon with a daughter and son-in-law, Boyse, must have caused all the confusion in Gascoigne's life; but the legal documents do not allow of such an interpretation, and it is therefore assumed that her father, while not of London, was confused with his brothers, Thomas and James, who were of London.

² P.C.C., Chayney 16. Preserved in Somerset House, London.

³ P.C.C., Peter 28.

of the said Elizabeth Gascoyne, or if his wife died before Elizabeth the £450 was to be delivered to William Webb, citizen and salter of London, to discharge to the same effect.

The next bit of evidence in this unusual case is an excerpt from a diary of Henry Machyn, which has been published in the Camden Society publications under date of September 30, 1562, as follows: "The same day at nyght bi-twyn viij and ix was a grett fray in Redcrosse Stret betwyn ij gentylmen and ther men, for they dyd maree one woman and dyvers wher hurtt; these were ther names, Master Boyssse and master Gaskyn gentylmen."¹

Apparently George Gascoigne landed in prison over this strange affair. For Edward Boys of London brought suit in the Queen's Court against "George Gascoyn of London esquire in the custody of the marshal," for the sum of £500 regarding the inheritance of the Breton children. Thus it seems that each man was quite willing and eager to claim the widow of William Breton as his wife, and each was equally willing to act as custodian of the bequests left by William Breton to his children.

All of the documents in the case have not been forthcoming, so it is with great difficulty that the intricacies of the affair are patched together; but there was claim and counterclaim by each man in the Chancery Court² and the Court of Wards and Liveries.³ However, the matter was finally adjusted to the satisfaction of Gascoigne, for the Queen on February 17, 1569,⁴ took the case out of her court of Wards and Liveries, and herself granted to "our beloved George Gascoyne" the custody of the life and marriage of Richard Breton during his minority, together with an annuity of £15 out of the proceeds from the property left by William Breton to his son, Richard. This annuity was to run from the day when Breton died⁵ (January 12, 1559) until the then present time, and to continue until such time as Richard might attain his majority.

How Gascoigne succeeded in gaining the favour of "good

¹ Inasmuch as the marriage of Gascoigne and Elizabeth occurred on November 17, 1562, it is small wonder that this ante-nuptial presumption of his caused a great uproar and "fray in Redcrosse Stret."

² P.R.O., Chancery Proceedings, Series II, 71/71; Chancery Proceedings, Series II, 78/55; *Coram Rege* Roll, 1206.

³ The matter before this court is known only by reference occurring in other documents, as search failed to trace the W. & L. documents.

⁴ P.R.O., Patent Roll, 11 Elizabeth, Part 8, mem. 10.

⁵ The fact that the annuity was to run from the date of William Breton's death may imply that the marriage of George Gascoigne to Elizabeth occurred shortly thereafter, but this is only conjecture.

Queen Bess," is problematical ; but it is not unlikely that influence was exerted by reason of the kinship between Gascoigne's wife, Elisabeth, and the Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, Sir Nicholas Bacon, who was a distant cousin of her father's.

At last the poet's fortunes seem to have changed. He was assured of an income of at least £15. By being made legal custodian of William Breton's children by his wife Elisabeth, the recognition of Gascoigne's marriage to her was achieved. Thus the matrimonial tangle was solved to the poet's satisfaction.¹ But there was still the financial embarrassment visited on George by his father's avaricious though possibly justifiable act. This too, however, was at length adjudicated favourably for George when, on June 1, 1569,² by gracious act of the Queen, entry was granted to George and his heirs forever, to all the lands, manors, tenements, farms, etc., which should have come to him on the death of his father.

With the revelation of these facts in the matters of his disinheritance and marriage, it is not difficult to believe that the poet was thinking of his plight in one or both cases when he wrote the following verse :

One onely dismall day, suffised (with despite)
To take me from my carvers place, and from the table quite.
Five hundred broken sleepes, had busied all my braynes,
To find (at last) some worthy trade that might increase my gaynes :
One blacke unluckie houre my trade hath overthrowen,
And marrde my marte, & broke my bank, & al my blisse oreblowen.
To wrappe up all in woe, I am in prison pent,
My gaines possessed by my foes, my friends against me bent.
And all the heavy haps, that ever age yet bare,
Assembled are within my breast, to choake me up with care.

This verse was chosen more or less at random from "The Complaint of the Greene Knight," an autobiographical poem ; but its like in grief, woe, and disappointment may be seen in many other pieces in Gascoigne's *Poesies*. But enough of poetry, since, as in the Bible, a verse can always be found to prove any doubtful point.

¹ The discrepancy of dates still excites doubt, especially in view of the Queen's grant of custody running from the death of William Breton, January 12, 1559, but the final outcome was satisfactory: date of marriage, November 17, 1562; fray in Redcross Street, September 30, 1562; date of Chancery and other Court proceedings *re* Breton children, October 7, 1562, and some time between October, 1562, and Easter, 1563.

² P.R.O., Patent Roll, 11 Elizabeth, Part 4, mem. 26.

JOHNSON'S LETTERS

BY R. W. CHAPMAN

THE rough check-list of Johnson's extant letters which is printed below has an exploratory purpose. Though I have been collecting and watching for fifteen years, I know that recorded, and presumably extant, letters are unseen by me, and suspect that unrecorded letters are still in hiding. I am therefore very grateful for this opportunity of declaring the extent of my knowledge and my ignorance; and I intend to ask librarians and others to be so good as to keep the off-prints which I shall send them, and to use them to check anything that may turn up. Meanwhile I hope this list may have some value in itself, as a sort of chart of Johnson's life.

The preservation of Johnson's letters as objects of general curiosity began in his own lifetime. Of his extant letters more than two-thirds belong to the last ten years of his life. This suggests that by the time his writings and the rumour of his talk had made him famous—so that crowds gathered to watch him go to church, and his conduct was influenced by his fear of the newspapers¹—any letter written by him had a chance of survival, as a thing worth keeping, worth showing, perhaps worth printing. Good manners prevented the publication in his lifetime of more than a few notorious specimens; but his death was followed immediately by publication in newspapers and within a few years by the publication of collections. Boswell deposited, or intended to deposit, chosen examples in the British Museum.

Any letter that survived Johnson's death was likely, in the years that have succeeded it, to be known for what it was and to be preserved as a literary curiosity. There may have been tragic accidents; the fate of Johnson's letters to Boswell is still unknown. But it is not very probable that letters have perished, since the history of their publication began in 1784, by ignorance or by indifference. As collectors' pieces, passing under the auctioneer's hammer and

¹ *Life*, ed. Hill-Powell, iii. 330.

through the hands of autograph dealers, Johnson's letters have a history which begins before 1850.

The occasional publication of the letters may be said to begin with the *Gentleman's Magazine* for December 1784. It has continued ever since, in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, in *Notes & Queries*, the *Athenæum*, the *Times*, and elsewhere. Their collection for publication in volumes began almost as soon. Boswell was early in the field. He had in his "archives" nearly one hundred letters to himself, and had already made repeated efforts to secure texts of the letters to Chesterfield and Macpherson before it should be too late. Now, his journals and letters show him applying in London, in Oxford, in Lichfield for information and for documents. His success was very considerable; but he might have done more than our records show. For Lichfield he seems to have relied on Miss Seward, who did not serve him well,¹ and on Miss Porter, who furnished only a fraction of what she must have had.² A mixture of motives might deter her from giving up the letters which Johnson had written to his mother and herself in the year of *Rasselas*. Of the ladies on Stow Hill, Miss Aston (to whom nearly all Johnson's letters were *directed*) died in 1785; Mrs. Gastrel may have had scruples.

From Hector of Birmingham, one of Johnson's oldest friends, Boswell had three letters. These no doubt came from the top drawer; for they are the latest of the sixteen letters to Hector which have survived.

With Taylor, another of Johnson's oldest associates, we know that Boswell did his best. His journal records that Taylor "dictated a great deal." But he would not give up his letters. Boswell was able to print only three letters, all of which Taylor had printed himself.³ But Taylor had kept more than a hundred, nearly all of which have since been traced.

In Johnson's London circle there are some notable gaps. Boswell had promises from Frank Barber of "every scrap of his master's handwriting" that could be found. But he had already burned "some letters from Dr. Johnson to Mrs. Johnson."⁴ In the event we have but few of the letters which Johnson, when out of London,

¹ Perhaps from disaffection, perhaps because she owed a different allegiance.

² Eleven letters; 54 have survived.

³ In his *Letter to Samuel Johnson on a Future State*, 1787.

⁴ *Boswell Papers*, xvi. 148.

must have written to members of his household. We do not know if Boswell made any application to Mrs. Montagu¹ or to Mrs. Garrick² or to Lady Di Beauclerk.³ We know that he was repulsed by Miss Burney and failed to conquer the scruples of Miss Reynolds.

He was more successful with Miss Burney's father and with Miss Reynolds's brother. Burke, I think, must have been drawn blank. Langton, of course, gave all he could find. So did Tom Warton and perhaps his brother, though most of the letters to Joseph were published later. Boswell's application to Hastings was a triumphant success; perhaps he made none to Sir Robert Chambers, who was in India. He was not, as Hill supposed, refused the letters to Perkins; he had all there were, but rightly rejected most of them as trivial. His failure to get the letters to William Strahan is unexplained. He was in communication with Strahan, who sent him one letter with a covering note explaining it. He printed, moreover, two letters from Johnson to Mrs. Strahan. Strahan, however, died in 1785. Boswell may or may not have communicated with his son George. Whatever George might wish about letters to his father, he is not likely to have wished Johnson's letters to himself to be made public.

Boswell knew that it was vain to look for letters from Johnson to Goldsmith; for Percy had shown him in 1775 the scanty collection of documents which was all Goldsmith could produce of materials for his life. It is surprising that Boswell got nothing from his "friend the Bishop of Dromore" himself. He applied to him and in a second letter reminded him of his "obliging promise" of materials.⁴ But he got no letters, though ten have been found.

With Malone to help the search, Boswell had at command the letters which had appeared in the magazines and in the two supplementary volumes of the *Works*⁵—notably those to Cave, to Baretti, and to Nichols; though of the last he made a cursory use. All told, he printed in the first and second editions of the *Life* some 340 letters or parts of letters. Towards the end of his book he was

¹ Nine letters to her are extant.

² Eight letters to the Garricks are extant.

³ A fragment of a letter to Beauclerk is in the *Life*; it was quoted by Langton from memory.

⁴ Boswell's Letters, 228 and 241.

⁵ Vols. xiv. and xv., 1788-9.

embarrassed by the bulk and character of his materials, and was glad to abridge the letters, to physicians and others, in which Johnson reiterated the symptoms of mortal disease.

If Boswell ever contemplated an attack on Mrs. Piozzi, he must soon have learned that it would be fruitless, for she was early in the field against him. We must rejoice that it was so; for the *Life* would not have gained by the addition of a bulky mass of materials which Boswell was not fully competent to assimilate. It was fortunate for him, again, that Mrs. Piozzi had her hands full. She may have had nearly five hundred letters to herself and members of her family; and since an accommodating publisher insisted that she give the world specimens of her own letters, she was able to fill two octavos without much padding from outside. At an early stage, however, she was afraid she might be short, and employed Anna Seward, by whose good offices she secured the letters to Miss Boothby.¹ These, and those to Sastres, are almost her only make-weights. She printed about 320 letters to herself, her mother, her husband, and two of her daughters.

We need not doubt the success of Mrs. Piozzi's collection. But it was never reprinted, perhaps because a selection from it was included, with or without authority, in the edition of the *Works* published in 1792. It stood, however, as an independent collection, and was in many libraries. Except for Croker's ill-judged attempt to turn the *Life* into a "harmony," no editor sought to weave the Piozzi letters into a wider Johnsonian pattern until, more than a century after Johnson's death, Birkbeck Hill compiled the first edition of his letters as such.

The *Life*, on the other hand, continued the process of accretion. Both Malone and Croker added such letters as came to their notice. Croker's contribution was of great importance. When Hill came to the task of editing Boswell, he rightly judged that this process had gone too far. He determined to revert to the edition of 1799, the last in which Boswell had a hand, and to leave all other letters for separate treatment.² His great edition of the *Life* (1887) was followed accordingly by a separate edition (1892) of all the letters known to him which were not included in the third edition of the *Life*. To this he added a substantial supplement in his *Johnsonian Miscellanies* (1897).

¹ I rely on unpublished documents in the John Rylands Library.

² He included *new* letters, however, in appendixes to his *Life*.

The new edition which is in contemplation will be largely based on that of Hill, but will be on a somewhat different plan. It will include all Johnson's letters; Hill omitted those which were included in the text of the *Life*, though he retained them in his numeration. That numeration will be preserved and supplemented, as students of the revised *Life* already know.

The distribution of Johnson's letters in this country and in the United States illustrates the spread of his fame. The condensed list of owners which follows may be of interest in this light. I know of no example in any British Dominion, in any Continental library, in Ireland, or in Cambridge (England).

*Owners.*¹—Aberdeen University Library; *Atlantic Monthly*; R. B. Adam; Messrs. Bain; O. R. Barrett; F. Bemis; L. Bergson; E. Beyer; Birmingham Reference Library; Reginald Blunt; Boston Public Library; J. E. Brown; Buffalo Public Library; R. W. Chapman; Lady Charnwood; Checquers; Viscount Chewton; Clifton College; Rupert Colomb; Sir Walter Congreve; The Earl of Crawford; F. Crooks; Edinburgh: National Library of Scotland; F. Edwards; W. Elkins; Amos Ettinger; R. Fletcher; Folger Library; J. Grant; E. Byrne Hackett; F. Leverton Harris; Harvard College Library; Haverford College; F. Hollyer; Lady Hudson; J. D. Hughes; Huntington Library; Sir Francis Hyett; R. H. Isham; the late Charles T. Jeffery (sale of 1936); Bennet Langton; The Marquis of Lansdowne; C. S. Lewis; Lichfield: the Birthplace; London: British Museum, College of Surgeons, Dyce-Forster Collection, Guildhall, Johnson House, Patent Office, Society of Antiquaries; A. T. Loyd; Mrs. Maas; Messrs. Maggs; Manchester: the Rylands Library; W. Marchbank; Messrs. Elkin Mathews; Mrs. Merivale; The Morgan Library; Harold Murdock; A. H. Hallam Murray; A. E. Newton; R. J. Nicol; E. D. North; Oxford: Bodleian, Pembroke, Oriel, Trinity; D. F. Pennant; Pennsylvania Historical Society; O. T. Perkins; C. Price; Princeton College Library; R. G. Pruden; Rochester University, N.Y.; The Earl of Rosebery; A. S. W. Rosenbach, and the Rosenbach Co.; Sir Charles Russell; E. Sadler; C. J. Sawyer; A. Scheuer; Sir Samuel Scott; C. Sessler;

¹ Some of these are dead; but I have retained their names in my lists, *honoris causa*.

G. S. Seymour; D. Nichol Smith; W. T. Spencer; Stafford: the Salt Library; Messrs. Tregaskis; C. Tildesley; T. E. Watson; Mrs. Webster; G. Wells; O. D. Young.

The entries in the list are necessarily condensed; but their significance will be clear if the following points are grasped.

The numbers are either those of Birkbeck Hill's edition of the *Letters* (Oxford, 1892) or are intercalated by me (e.g. 2.1) in chronological sequence. Accordingly:

I. Letters numbered by Hill *either* (1) were printed by him in 1892 or (2) had been printed by him in his text (1887) of the *Life*, in which case he did not reprint them.

Letters *printed* by Hill 1892 accordingly need no further *reference*. Letters cited from the *Life* may not be so easy to find (Boswell's order not being strictly chronological); accordingly I give a reference (1.138) to Hill's *Life*.

The right-hand column gives also indications of *source* or *ownership*. It may in general be presumed that letters *printed* by Hill were seen by him, unless a *source*¹ (Malone, Croker, etc.) is given; and that they have not been seen by me, unless I indicate ownership or (for brevity) add the word *seen*.

II. Letters with "decimal" numbers may in general be presumed to have been seen by me (or one of my helpers) unless I indicate a *source* (e.g. Hill's own later *Johnsonian Miscellanies*, or a source overlooked by him or not known to him) or add the words *not seen*. But as a rule I indicate the ownership, for convenience and interest, when I know it (or knew it at the date of my information. Many letters have been shot on the wing, between one owner and another).

Date and Place.—The *dates* are those in the source, conjectural elements being bracketed; but the day of the week is inferential *unless* it is unabbreviated. The *place* is not given, unless it is in the source.

Sources (other than owners):

A.P.C.: *Autograph Prices Current*.

Cancelled proof: proofs cancelled in 1788 by Mrs. Piozzi, which I have seen.

Croker: his editions of Boswell.

¹ But it did not seem necessary to indicate that the Piozzi *Letters*, 1788, was Hill's source for the letters to Thrales; in these cases the space is often wanted for more important information.

G.M. : *Gentleman's Magazine*.

Hawkins : *Life of Johnson*, 1787.

J.M. : Hill's *Johnsonian Miscellanies*, 1897.

Malone : his editions of Boswell.

Nichols : *Literary Anecdotes*.

Philobiblon Society's *Miscellanies*.

Piozzi : *Letters to and from Johnson*, 1788.

Prior : *Life of Goldsmith*.

Shorter : a privately printed edition of letters in his possession by Clement King Shorter.

S. 3 : 12 : 30 etc. ; Sotheby's Auction Catalogues.

Warner : Rebecca Warner's *Original Letters*, 1817.

Wooll : his *Life of Joseph Warton*.

" 4.245 " : Hill's Boswell.

Since this list was set up, the discovery has been made known of a large number of the letters printed by Boswell from the originals. Among the Forbes papers at Fettercairn House, Professor C. Collier Abbott found about 120 letters from Johnson to various persons, most of which Boswell used, in whole or in part, for the *Life*. It is now possible to determine Boswell's source for almost all the letters printed by him, though Johnson's letters to *him* are unhappily still missing.

I indicate the Fettercairn letters by *F.* in the right-hand column. For further information see the *Catalogue* compiled by Professor Abbott and published by the Oxford University Press, 1936.

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 1 | Sa. Oct. 30 | Lichfield | 1731 Hickman | R.B.A. |
| 2 | Th. July 27 | Lichfield | 1732 Taylor | R.B.A. |
| 2.1 | W. Sept. 18 | | 1734 — | S. 4 : 12 : 16 |
| 3 | M. Nov. 25 | Lichfield | Cave ¹ | i. 91 R.B.A. |
| 3.1 | Su. May 18 | Lichfield | 1735 G. Repington | Congreve |
| 3.2 | W. June 25 | Gt. Haywood | Congreve | " |
| 4 | Tu. July 12 | Greenwich | 1737 Cave | i. 107 R.B.A. |

¹ The letters to Cave are in *G.M.*, Jan. 1785 (or later).

| | | | | |
|------|--|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| | | | 1738 | |
| 5 | Wednesday (1738) | Castle-st. | Cave | i. 120 |
| 6 | Monday (1738) | Castle-St. | " | i. 121 R.B.A. |
| 7 | April | | " | i. 122 R.B.A. |
| 8 | (1738) | | " | i. 123 |
| 9 | Wednesday (1738) | | " | i. 136 R.B.A. |
| 10 | (1738) | | " | i. 137 Rose- bery |
| 11 | (1738) | | " | i. 138 R.B.A. |
| | | | 1740 | |
| 12 | Th. Jan. 31 | | Eliz. Johnson | F. Bemis |
| | | | 1741 | |
| 13 | Sa. Jan. 31 | St. John's Gate | Paul | B'ham P.L. |
| 14 | Tu. March 31 | Black Boy, Strand | " | " |
| | | | 1742 | |
| 14.1 | Sa. Jan. 2 | | Taylor | S. 31 : 3 : 75 not seen |
| 15 | (or 1743) | | Cave | i. 155 R.B.A. |
| 16 | (1742) | | " | i. 156 R.B.A. |
| 17 | June 10 (? Aug.) | | Taylor | Loyd |
| | | | 1743 | |
| 17.1 | Jan. | | | Malone ^e iv.7; lost |
| 18 | Thursday, Sept. 29 | | Birch | i. 160 B.M. |
| 19 | Th. Dec. 1 | Gray's Inn | Levett (?) | i. 160 F. |
| | | | 1744 | |
| 20 | Tu. Jan. 3 | | Levett | seen |
| 21 | Sat. Morning | Golden Arches | " | R.B.A. |
| 22 | | | Mr. Urban | i. " 164 mis- placed by H. |
| 23 | Aug. 1743 | | | |
| | | | 1746 | |
| 23.1 | F. Dec. 26 | | Dodsley | Morgan |
| | | | 1747 | |
| 23.2 | (1747) | | Dodsley | R.B.A. |
| 23.3 | (1747 ?) | Golden Arches | Longman | Huntington |
| | | | 1749 | |
| 24 | Th. 20 Apr. (<i>Memoirs of S. J.</i> , 1785) | | Elphinston | Johnson House |
| 25 | W. July 12 | Goff Square | Porter | seen |
| 26 | Saturday | | Levett (?) | seen |
| | | | 1750 | |
| 27 | (April) | | Gen. Advertiser | i. 127 |
| 28 | Sa. May 12 | Gough Sq. | Birch | i. 226 B.M. |
| 29 | See below, after 36 | | | |
| 30 | Tu. Sept. 25 | | Elphinston | i. 211 |
| | 29 and 30 were published by | Elphinston, 1791 | | |
| 30.1 | Su. Sept. 30 | Elphinston | | lost |

| | | | |
|--|------|--|------------------------|
| | | 1751 | |
| | 31 | Sa. March 9 | Richardson |
| | 32 | Th. April 18 | Newbery |
| | 32.1 | Su. July 21 (?) See 110.1 | Levett |
| | 33 | M. July 29 | Newbery |
| | 34 | Sa. Aug. 24 | " |
| | 35 | F. Nov. 1 | W. Strahan |
| | 36 | Tu. Dec. 10 | — |
| | 29 | (1751 or 52) See note on 30 | Elphinston |
| | 37 | | W. Strahan |
| | 38 | | " |
| | 39 | | " |
| | | 1752 | |
| | 40 | Sa. March 7 | Levett |
| | 41 | Tu. March 17 | Taylor |
| | 42 | W. March 18 | " |
| | 42.1 | Su. July 26 | Levett |
| | 43 | Sa. Nov. 4 | Birch |
| | 44 | Sa. July 11 | A. Millar |
| | | 1753 | |
| | 45 | Sa. Jan. 20 | Birch |
| | 46 | Th. March 8 | J. Warton |
| | 47 | Th. March 22 (1753 ?) | W. Strahan |
| | 48 | Th. Apr. 17 (1753) | Richardson |
| | 49 | W. Sept. 26 | " |
| | 49.1 | Thursday (1753) | " |
| | 49.2 | (1753) | " |
| | | 1754 | |
| | 50 | (Jan. 1754) | Birch |
| | 51 | F. March 8 | J. Warton |
| | 51.1 | Th. March 28 | Richardson |
| | 52 | (? July, 1734) | W. Strahan |
| | 53 | Tu. July 16 | T. Warton ¹ |
| | 54 | Th. Nov. 21 | Chambers |
| | 55 | Th. Nov. 28 | T. Warton |
| | 56 | Sa. Dec. 21 | " |
| | 57 | Tu. Dec. 24 | J. Warton |
| | | 1755 | |
| | 57.1 | W. Jan. 1 | Mrs. Galway |
| | 58 | Sa. Feb. 1 (sic) | T. Warton |
| | 58.1 | M. Feb. 3 | Richardson |
| | 59 | Tu. Feb. 4 | T. Warton |
| | 60 | Th. Feb. 13 | " |
| | 61 | F. Feb. 7 | Chesterfield |
| | 62 | Tu. Feb. (25) | T. Warton |
| | 63 | W. 4 Cal. Mart. Londini | Huddesford |
| | 64 | Th. March 20 | T. Warton |
| | 65 | Tuesday, March 25 | " |
| | 66 | Sa. March 29 | Birch |
| | 67 | Tu. April 8 Gough Square | Burney |
| | 68 | F. April 11 | Taylor |
| | 69 | Tu. April 15 Gough Square | Hector |
| | | ¹ (The letters to T. Warton were copied for J.B. They remain at Trinity College.) | |
| | | | Morgan |
| | | | Prior |
| | | | R.B.A. |
| | | | Prior |
| | | | " |
| | | | R.B.A. |
| | | | S. 10 : 5 : 75 ; |
| | | | not seen |
| | | | i. 210 ; seen |
| | | | R.B.A. |
| | | | " |
| | | | " |
| | | | R.B.A. |
| | | | (i. 238) ; lost |
| | | | i. 238 Loyd |
| | | | R.B.A. |
| | | | B.M. |
| | | | B.M. |
| | | | i. 253 F. |
| | | | R.B.A. |
| | | | seen |
| | | | Huntington |
| | | | J.M. 2.435 |
| | | | B.M. |
| | | | Wooll |
| | | | Bemis |
| | | | i. 270 Trinity |
| | | | i. 274 Trinity |
| | | | i. 275 Trinity |
| | | | i. 276 Trinity |
| | | | Wooll |
| | | | R.B.A. |
| | | | i. 278 Trinity |
| | | | Huntington |
| | | | i. 278 Trinity |
| | | | i. 279 Trinity |
| | | | i. 261 |
| | | | i. 279 Trinity |
| | | | i. 282 R.B.A. |
| | | | i. 282 Trinity |
| | | | i. 283 Trinity |
| | | | i. 285 B.M. |
| | | | i. 286 |
| | | | Christie |
| | | | 5 : 6 : 88 ; |
| | | | not seen |
| | | | S. 5 : 6 : 29 |

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|------------------|
| <i>1755—continued</i> | | |
| 70 | Tu. May 6 | Langton |
| 71 | Tu. May 13 | T. Warton |
| 71.1 | Tu. May 13 | Hector |
| 72 | Tu. June 10 | T. Warton |
| 73 | Tu. June 24 | " |
| 74 | Sa. July 19 | (Miss Cotterell) |
| 74.1 | M. Aug. 4 Oxford | Chambers |
| 75 | Th. Aug. 7 | T. Warton |
| 75.1 | Th. Aug. 7 | Chambers |
| 75.2 | Th. Oct. 16 | Congreve |
| 76 | Sa. (8 Nov. 1755) | Birch |
| 77 | M. 23 (22) Dec. | Paul |
| 78 | Tu. Dec. 30 | Boothby |
| 79 | W. Dec. 31 | " |
| <i>1756</i> | | |
| 80 | Th. Jan. 1 | Boothby |
| 81 | Sa. Jan. 3 | " |
| 82 | Sa. (Jan. 3) | " |
| 83 | Tu. Jan. 6 | Paul |
| 84 | Th. Jan. 8 | Boothby |
| 85 | F. Jan. 9 | Birch |
| 86 | Tuesday, Jan. 13 | Paul |
| 87 | W. Jan. 14 Gough Square | E. Carter |
| 88 | (Jan. 1756) | J. Ryland |
| 89 | (Jan. 1756) | Cave |
| 90 | Th. Feb. 19 | Richardson |
| 91 | Wednesday | Paul |
| 92 | F. March 12 | " |
| 93 | (March, 1756) | Hawkesworth |
| 94 | Tu. March 16 (1756) Gough Square | Richardson |
| 95 | Sa. (20 March, 1756) | Birch |
| 96 | Th. April 15 | J. Warton |
| 97 | Tu. June 22 | Birch |
| 98 | Sa. July 31 | Taylor |
| 98.1 | Sa. July 31 | Chambers |
| 99 | W. Sept. 29 | Paul |
| 99.1 | Tu. Sept. 28 | — |
| 100 | Wednesday (1756) | Paul |
| 101 | Saturday (?) 18 Dec. 1756 | " |
| 102 | (1756) | " |
| 103 | Th. Oct. 7 | Hector |
| 104 | F. Oct. 8 | Paul |
| 105 | (1756) | " |
| 105.1 | Th. Nov. 11 | Hector |
| 106 | Th. Nov. 18 | Taylor |
| 106.1 | Thursday, Nov. (1756) | — |
| <i>1757</i> | | |
| 107 | Sa. April 9 London The copy used by J.B. | O'Connor |
| 108 | Sa. April 16 London | Hector |
| 109 | Tu. June 21 | T. Warton |
| 110 | See 1758 | |
| 110.1 | Th. July 21 (?) See 32.1 | Levett |
| 111 | Th. Oct. 27 | (T. Warton) |
| 112 | Sa. Dec. 24 Gough Square | Burney |

i. 288 F.
 i. 289 Trinity
 S. 5 : 6 : 29
 i. 289 Trinity
 i. 290 Trinity
 R.B.A.
 "
 i. 290 Trinity
 R.B.A.
 Congreve
 B.M.
 Croker ; seen
 by H.
 Newton
 Bergson
 iv. 57 Newton
 Johnson House
 R.B.A.
 B'ham P.L.
 Bergson
 B.M.
 B'ham P.L.
 R.B.A.
 Rylands
 G.M.
 R.B.A.
 B'ham P.L.
 Patent Office
 seen
 R.B.A.
 B.M.
 Wooll
 B.M.
 Loyd
 R.B.A.
 Paul
 Ettinger
 B'ham P.L.
 "
 "
 S. 5 : 6 : 29
 B'ham P.L.
 "
 S. 5 : 6 : 29
 Loyd
 Morgan
 i. 321 R.B.A.
 S. 5 : 6 : 29
 i. 322 Trinity
 R.B.A.
 Croker
 i. 323 Newton

1762—continued

| | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| 143 | Tu. July 20 | Bute | i. 376 |
| | Copy by Bute's son | | |
| 144 | Sa. July 24 | Porter | <i>Rylands</i> |
| 144.1 | Tu. Oct. 12 Inner Temple Lane | (H. Bright ?) | <i>Hodgson</i> 1927 |
| 144.2 | F. Oct. 22 | Chambers | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 145 | W. Nov. 3 Temple Lane | Bute | i. 380 (original <i>Huntington</i>) |
| | Copy by Lord Macartney | | <i>Croker</i> |
| 146 | Tu. Dec. 21 | F. Reynolds | i. 380 |
| 147 | Tu. Dec. 21 London | Baretti | |
| | Europ. Mag. 1788 | | |
| 147.1 | (? Dec.) | Beauclerk | i. 242; over-looked by H. |

1763

| | | | |
|-------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| 148 | Sa. Feb. 19 | G. Strahan | <i>S.</i> 11 : 2 : 29 |
| 148.1 | Tu. March 15 | Chambers | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 149 | Sa. March 26 | G. Strahan | <i>Croker</i> |
| 150 | Tu. April 12 | Porter | seen |
| 151 | Sa. April 16 | G. Strahan | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 152 | Sa. July 2 | G. Grenville | <i>Grenville Papers</i> |
| 153 | Tu. July 5 | Porter | <i>S.</i> 17 : 3 : 30 |
| 154 | Tu. July 12 | | <i>S.</i> 17 : 3 : 30 |
| 155 | Th. July 14 | G. Strahan | <i>S.</i> 11 : 2 : 29 |
| 156 | Sa. Aug. 13 | Taylor | <i>Loyd</i> |
| 157 | Th. Aug. 18 | " | " |
| 158 | Th. Aug. 25 | " | <i>Pembroke</i> |
| 159 | Sa. Sept. 3 | | <i>Loyd</i> |
| 160 | Tu. Sept. 20 | G. Strahan | <i>S.</i> 11 : 2 : 29 |
| 161 | Th. Sept. 29 | Taylor | <i>Loyd</i> |
| 162 | See after 167 | | |
| 163 | Th. Dec. 8 London | J.B. | i. 473 |

1764

| | | | |
|-------|----------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 164 | Tu. Jan. 10 London | Porter | seen |
| 165 | Tu. May 22 | Taylor | <i>Loyd</i> |
| 165.1 | Sa. June 23 London | Percy | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 166 | Su. Aug. 19 (wrong) Easton | J. Reynolds | i. 486 F. |
| | Maudit | | |
| 166.1 | M. Aug. 20 | Percy | lost ? |
| 167 | W. Oct. 24 | W. Strahan | |
| 162 | Th. Oct. 27 Oxford | F. Reynolds | <i>Colomb</i> |

1765

| | | | |
|-------|------------------------------|--------------|------------------|
| 168 | Sa. May 18 | Garrick | seen |
| 169 | May 25 (not 1765 ?) | " | <i>Elkins</i> |
| 170 | Sa. May 25 | G. Strahan | <i>Croker</i> |
| 171 | M. July 15 Temple | Taylor | <i>Loyd</i> |
| 172 | Tu. Aug. 13 London | H.L.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 173 | Autumn | H. or H.L.T. | lost |
| 174 | Sa. Aug. 17 | (Ed. Lye) | |
| 174.1 | Th. Sept. 26 Johnson's Court | Ed. Lye | <i>Newton</i> |
| 175 | W. Oct. 2 Johnson's Court | Taylor | <i>Haverford</i> |
| 176 | W. Oct. 9 | J. Warton | <i>Wooll</i> |
| 176.1 | W. Oct. 9 Johnson's Court | Tonson | <i>Lichfield</i> |
| 177 | W. Oct. 16 | Burney | i. 500; seen |
| 178 | Th. Oct. 17 Johnson's Court | Leland | <i>Malone</i> |

JOHNSON'S LETTERS

151

1765—continued

178.1 Sa. Oct. 19 Johnson's Court Tonson
 178.2 Sa. Oct. 26 C. Jenkinson
 179 Su. Dec. 8 Hector
 179.1 (? 1765) Dodsley

Lichfield
B.M.
S. 5 : 6 : 29
S. 7 : 12 : 00 ;
 not seen

1766

180 Tu. Jan. 14 Johnson's Court Porter
 181 Tu. Jan. 14 Johnson's Court J.B.
 182 March 9 (8) Johnson's Court Langton
 183 Sa. May 10 Johnson's Court
 183.1 Sa. June 28 W. Jessop
 184 W. Aug. 13 Johnson's Court W. Drummond
 185 Th. Aug. 21 London J.B.
 186 F. Oct. 10 Garrick
 187 Th. Nov. 13 Porter
 187.1 W. Nov. 19 Chambers
 187.2 Th. Dec. 11 "

S. 17 : 3 : 30
 ii. 3
 ii. 16 *F.*
 ii. 17 *F.*
B.M.
 ii. 27
 ii. 20
Murdoch
Ettinger
R.B.A.
 "

1767

187.3 Th. Jan. 22 London Chambers
 188 Sa. Feb. 14 Mrs. Salusbury
 189 Tu. April 21 Johnson's W. Drummond
 Court
 189.1 May 11 Oxford H.L.T.
 189.2 W. June 17 Lichfield Lawrence
 189.3 Sa. June 20 Lichfield Lawrence
 190 M. July 20 Lichfield H.L.T.
 190.1 W. Aug. 19 Colman
 191 Sa. Oct. 3 Lichfield H.L.T.
 192 Sa. Oct. 10 Lichfield Langton
 192.1 Sa. Oct. 10 Lichfield H.L.T.
 193 Sa. Oct. 24 Johnson's Court W. Drummond
 193.1 Nov. 3 Johnson's Court Hector
 194 Tu. Nov. 17 Eliz. Aston

R.B.A.
Bergson
 ii. 29
Bergson
Ettinger
Bergson
Colman Letters
 1820
S. 15 : 2 : 26
 ii. 45 *F.*
Johnson House
 ii. 30
Ettinger
 seen

1768

194.1 M. Feb. 29 New Inn Hall H.L.T.
 195 Th. March 3 "
 196 Th. March 3 New Inn Hall R. Pennick
 197 M. March 14 H.L.T.
 198 Th. March 17 Oxford Apperley
 199 F. March 18 H.L.T.
 200 W. March 23 Oxford J.B.
 201 Th. March 24 Oxford H.L.T.
 202 M. April 18 Oxford Porter
 Harwood's copy is at Pembroke
 203 Tu. April 19 Oxford H.L.T.
 203.1 F. April 22 Weston
 204 Th. April 28 Oxford H.L.T.
 204.1 Th. April 28 Weston
 205 M. May 23 H.L.T.
 206 Sa. May 28 F. A. Barnard
 207 Sa. May 28 F. Barber

R.B.A.
S. 30 : 1 : 18 ;
 not seen
R.B.A.
S. 30 : 1 : 18 ;
 not seen
Oriel
S. 5 : 5 : 30
 ii. 58
R.B.A.
Malone
Jeffery
B.M.
S. 30 : 1 : 18 ;
 not seen
B.M.
R.B.A.
B.M.
 ii. 62 *F.*

1768—continued

| | | | | |
|-------|-------------|--------|--------|------------------------------|
| 207.1 | Tu. June 7 | London | Porter | R.B.A. |
| 208 | F. June 17 | | H.L.T. | " |
| 209 | Sa. June 18 | | Porter | |
| 209.1 | July 12 | | " | Lichfield |
| 210 | F. Nov. 11 | | H.L.T. | S. 4 : 6 : 08 ; not seen |
| 211 | F. Dec. 2 | | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 211.1 | W. Dec. 14 | | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |

1769

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| 212 | Tu. Jan. 17 | | Colman | R.B.A. |
| 213 | F. Mar. 31 | Londres | L. Flint | Newton |
| | Copy by H.L.T. | | | |
| 214 | Th. May 18 | | H.L.T. | Jeffery |
| 215 | W. May 31 | | T. Warton | ii. 67 Trinity |
| 216 | Tu. June 27 | New Inn Hall | H.L.T. | S. 15 : 2 : 26 |
| 217 | Th. June 29 | Oxford | " | Maggs, 1921 ; not seen |
| 218 | Th. June 29 | New Inn Hall | H.T. | seen |
| 219 | Th. July 6 | | H.L.T. | Jeffery |
| 220 | M. Aug. 14 | | " | Lichfield |
| 221 | Sa. Aug. 26 | Brighthelmstone | Eliz. Aston | Tildesley |
| 222 | Sa. Sept. 9 | Brighthelmstone | J.B. | ii. 70 |
| 223 | Th. Oct. 5 | | Taylor | S. 14 : 4 : 30 |
| 224 | Su. Nov. 5 | | Percy | Dyce-Forster |
| 225 | Th. Nov. 9 | | J.B. | ii. 110 |

1770

| | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------|
| 226 | Tu. Jan. 9 | Johnson's Court | (H. Bright) | B.M. |
| 226.1 | Sa. Jan. 13 | Oxford | H.L.T. | Perkins |
| 226.2 | Jan. 27 | | (H. Bright) | |
| 227 | W. March 21 | Johnson's Court | R. Farmer | ii. 114 F. |
| 227.1 | Sa. March 24 | | Chambers | R.B.A. |
| 227.2 | F. April 6 | | H.L.T. | Bergson |
| 228 | Tu. May 1 | | Porter | Croker |
| | Harwood's copy is at Pembroke | | | |
| 228.1 | Th. May 24 | London | — | seen |
| 229 | Tu. May 29 | London | Porter | Newton |
| 229.1 | W. June 13 | | Horneck | ii. 114 Trinity |
| 230 | Sa. June 23 | London | T. Warton | Stafford |
| 230.1 | M. June 25 | | — | Philobiblon Soc. |
| 231 | M. July 2 | Lichfield | Taylor | seen |
| 232 | Sa. July 7 | Lichfield | H.L.T. | seen |
| 233 | W. July 11 | Lichfield | H.L.T. | seen |
| 234 | Sa. July 14 | Lichfield | " | S. 22 : 7 : 29 |
| 235 | July (1770) | Lichfield | " | Lichfield |
| 236 | F. July 20 | Ashbourne | " | Bergson |
| 237 | M. July 23 | Ashbourne | " | " |
| 237.1 | Sa. July 28 | Ashbourne | " | Newton |
| 238 | Tu. Sept. 25 | London | F. Barber | ii. 115 F. |
| 239 | F. Sept. 28 | | J. Warton | ii. 115 F. |
| 240 | Tu. Oct. 2 | Johnson's Court | H.L.T. | R.B.A. |
| 240.1 | W. Oct. 24 | London | Langton | F. |
| 240.2 | W. Oct. 27 | | Percy | Barrett |
| 241 | F. Dec. 7 | | F. Barber | ii. 116 F. |

JOHNSON'S LETTERS

153

1771

| | | | | |
|-------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| 242 | F. Jan. 25 | | Smith | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 243 | Sa. Feb. 2 | | Rivington | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 244 | M. Feb. 18 | Johnson's Court | (R. Farmer) | <i>Folger</i> |
| 245 | March | | H.T. | <i>Bergson</i> |
| 246 | W. March 20 | | Langton | ii. 135 <i>F.</i> |
| 246.1 | Sa. April 6 | | Chambers | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 247 | W. April 17 | London | Miss Langton | <i>G.M.</i> 1800 |
| 247.1 | Tu. May 7 | | Mrs. Rolt | <i>Hudson</i> |
| 248 | Th. May 16 | | de Boufflers | <i>Jeffery</i> |
| 249 | Sa. June 15 | | H.L.T. | seen |
| 250 | Th. June 20 | London | J.B. | ii. 140 |
| 251 | Th. June 20 | | H.L.T. | <i>Lichfield</i> |
| 252 | Sa. June 22 | Lichfield | " | <i>S.</i> 30 : 1 : 18 ; |
| | | | | not seen |
| 253 | M. June 25 | | " | <i>Lichfield</i> |
| 254 | W. July 3 | Ashbourne | " | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 255 | Su. July 7 | Ashbourne | " | " |
| 256 | July (misdated) | Lichfield | " | <i>S.</i> 15 : 2 : 26 |
| 257 | M. July 8 | Ashbourne | " | <i>Newton</i> |
| 258 | W. July 10 | Ashbourne | " | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 259 | M. July 15 | Ashbourne | " | <i>O. D. Young</i> |
| 260 | W. July 17 | Ashbourne | " | <i>Lichfield</i> |
| 261 | W. July 17 | Ashbourne | J. Reynolds | ii. 141 <i>F.</i> |
| 262 | Sa. July 20 | Ashbourne | H.L.T. | <i>S.</i> 30 : 1 : 18 ; |
| | | | | not seen |
| 263 | M. July 22 | | " | seen |
| 264 | W. July 24 | Ashbourne | " | seen |
| 264.1 | Th. July 25 | Ashbourne | F. Reynolds | <i>Colomb</i> |
| 264.2 | M. July 29 | | " | " |
| 264.3 | July 29 | Ashbourne | H.M.T. | <i>Lansdowne</i> |
| 265 | W. July 31 | | H.T. | seen |
| 266 | Sa. Aug. 3 | Lichfield | H.L.T. | <i>Bemis</i> |
| 267 | M. Aug. 5 | Lichfield | " | <i>Lichfield</i> |
| 268 | Th. Aug. 29 | | Langton | ii. 142 <i>F.</i> |
| 268.1 | F. Aug. 30 | | Beattie | <i>Aberdeen</i> |
| 269 | Th. Dec. 12 | Streatham | Garrick | seen |
| 270 | (1771) | | -Cadell | lost |

1772

| | | | | |
|-------|--------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| 270.1 | Feb. 16 | | A Lady | <i>Thorpe Cat.</i> |
| | | | | 1843 ; lost |
| 271 | Th. Feb. 27 | | J. Reynolds | ii. 144 <i>F.</i> |
| 272 | Th. Feb. 27 | Johnson's Court | J. Banks | ii. 144 <i>F.</i> |
| 273 | Sa. March 14 | | Langton | ii. 146 <i>F.</i> |
| 274 | Su. March 15 | | J.B. | ii. 145 |
| 274.1 | M. April 6 | | S. Paterson | <i>Stafford</i> |
| 274.2 | Sa. April 11 | London | Chambers | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 275 | F. April 17 | | Taylor | <i>Philobiblon Soc.</i> |
| 275.1 | Sa. Aug. 15 | | " | <i>Reliquary</i> xiv. |
| 276 | M. Aug. 31 | | J.B. | ii. 201 |
| 277 | M. Aug. 31 | | Taylor | <i>Loyd</i> |
| 278 | Tu. Oct. 6 | | " | " |
| 278.1 | Th. Oct. 8 | | W. Strahan | <i>Shorter</i> |
| 278.2 | Tu. Oct. 13 | London | Taylor | <i>Harvard</i> |
| 278.3 | Th. Oct. 15 | | H.L.T. | <i>S.</i> 30 : 1 : 18 ; |
| | | | | not seen |
| 279 | M. Oct. 19 | | " | seen |
| 280 | Sa. Oct. 24 | Lichfield | " | <i>R.B.A.</i> |

1772—continued

| | | | | |
|-------|-------------|-----------|------------|-------------------------|
| 281 | Th. Oct. 29 | Ashbourne | H.L.T. | seen |
| 282 | Sa. Oct. 31 | | " | seen |
| 282.1 | M. Nov. 2 | Ashbourne | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 283 | W. Nov. 4 | Ashbourne | H.L.T. | |
| 284 | Sa. Nov. 7 | | " | S. 30:1:18; not seen |
| 285 | M. Nov. 9 | | " | seen |
| 285.1 | Sa. Nov. 14 | | " | |
| 286 | Th. Nov. 19 | | " | S. 30:1:18; not seen |
| 286.1 | Sa. Nov. 21 | | " | S. 5:5:30 |
| 287 | M. Nov. 23 | | " | S. 30:1:18; not seen |
| 288 | F. Nov. 27 | | " | S. 11:2:29 |
| 288.1 | Sa. Nov. 28 | | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 289 | Th. Dec. 3 | Lichfield | H.L.T. | R.B.A. |
| 289.1 | Th. Dec. 3 | Lichfield | Chambers | " |
| 289.2 | Sa. Dec. 5 | Lichfield | H.L.T. | " |
| 290 | Sa. Dec. 5 | Lichfield | Hector | S. 5:6:29 |
| 291 | Sa. Dec. 12 | | " | lost " |
| 291.1 | Sa. Dec. 12 | | Taylor | R.B.A. |
| 292 | Tu. Dec. 15 | | J. Granger | |

1773

| | | | | |
|-------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| 293 | Tu. Jan. 26 | | T.L.T. | S. 30:1:18; not seen |
| 294 | F. Feb. 19 | | " | S. 30:1:18; not seen |
| 295 | W. Feb. 24 | London | J.B. | ii. 204 |
| 296 | Sa. Feb. 27 | | Taylor | Morgan |
| 297 | Th. March 4 | Johnson's Court | Bond | ii. 207 |
| 298 | Th. March 4 | Johnson's Court | W. White | R.B.A. |
| 299 | Th. March 4 | Johnson's Court | W. S. Johnson | G.M. 1825 |
| 300 | Tu. March 9 | Johnson's Court | H.L.T. | R.B.A. |
| 301 | Th. March 11 | | " | " |
| 301.1 | F. March 12 | | " | |
| 301.2 | M. March 15 | | " | |
| 301.3 | Tu. March 16 | | " | |
| 302 | W. March 17 | | " | R.B.A. |
| 302.1 | F. March 19 | | " | Tildesley |
| 303 | Sa. March 20 | | " | S. 30:1:18; not seen |
| 303.1 | Sa. March 20 | | Taylor | not seen |
| 303.2 | Tu. March 23 | | H.L.T. | R.B.A. |
| 304 | Th. March 25 | | " | " |
| 304.1 | F. April 2 | | " | Lichfield |
| 305 | F. April 23 | | Goldsmith | Johnson House |
| 306 | Tu. April 27 | | H.L.T. | S. 15:2:26 |
| 306.1 | May 4 (? 1773) | | " | R.B.A. |
| 307 | Sa. May 8 | | T. Bagshaw | ii. 258 |
| 307.1 | (? May, 1773) | | H.L.T. | Rylands |
| 308 | M. May 17 | | " | seen |
| 309 | Sa. May 22 | | " | S. 1:8:35 |
| 310 | Su. May 23 | | " | O. D. Young |

JOHNSON'S LETTERS

155

1773—continued

| | | | |
|-------|--------------------------------------|----------------|---|
| 311 | M. May 24 | H.L.T. | <i>O. D. Young</i> |
| 311.1 | Sa. May 29 | " | <i>Maas</i> |
| 312 | Tu. June 22 (not 23) | Taylor | <i>Morgan</i> |
| 313 | M. July 5 Johnson's Court | J.B. | ii. 264 |
| 314 | Tu. Aug. 3 | " | ii. 265 |
| 315 | Tu. Aug. 3 | " | ii. 266 |
| 316 | Th. Aug. 5 | Taylor | <i>Loyd</i> |
| 316.1 | Th. Aug. 5 | Beattie | <i>Aberdeen</i> |
| 316.2 | M. Aug. 9 Northallerton | Percy | <i>S. 14 : 6 : 97 ;</i> not seen |
| 317 | W. Aug. 11 Newcastle | J.B. | ii. 266 |
| 318 | Th. Aug. 12 and 15 | H.L.T. | <i>Bergson</i> |
| 319 | Sa. Aug. 14 | J.B. | ii. 266 |
| 320. | Tu. Aug. 17 Edinburgh | H.L.T. | <i>Bergson and D.</i> <i>Nichol Smith</i> <i>Morgan</i> |
| 321 | W. Aug. 25 Bamff | " | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 322 | Sa. Aug. 28 Inverness | " | <i>Loyd</i> |
| 323 | M. Sept. 6 Skie | " | v. 182 <i>Isham</i> |
| 324 | Tu. Sept. 14 Skie | " | |
| 325 | Tu. Sept. 14 Skie | Elibank | |
| | Boswell's copy | | |
| 326 | Tu. Sept. 21 Skie | H.L.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 327 | F. Sept. 24 Skie | " | <i>Bergson</i> |
| 328 | Tu. Sept. 28 Skie | Macleod | <i>Macleod</i> |
| 329 | Th. Sept. 30 Skie | H.L.T. | <i>Bergson</i> |
| 329.1 | Th. Sept. 30 Skie | Chambers | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 330 | F. Oct. 15 Isle of Mull | H.T. | |
| 331 | F. Oct. 15 Mull | H.L.T. | <i>Newton</i> |
| 331.1 | F. Oct. 15 Isle of Mull | Charabers | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 332 | Sa. Oct. 23 Inverary | H.L.T. | " |
| 333 | Sa. Oct. 23 Inverary | H.T. | " |
| 334 | Tu. Oct. 26 Inverary | " | <i>Jeffery</i> |
| 335 | W. Oct. 27 Rosedow, Loch- lomonid | Duke of Argyle | v. 363 |
| 336 | Th. Oct. 28 Glasgow | H.L.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 337 | W. Nov. 3 Auchinleck | " | <i>Newton</i> |
| 338 | F. Nov. 12 Edinburgh | " | |
| 339 | Th. Nov. 18 Edinburgh | " | <i>S. 30 : 1 : 18 ;</i> not seen |
| 340 | Sa. Nov. 27 | J.B. | ii. 268 |
| 340.1 | Sa. Nov. 27 | Chambers | <i>R.B.A.</i> |

1774

| | | | |
|-------|--------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| 341 | Tu. Jan. 11 | Mrs. Montague | <i>Huntington</i> |
| 342 | Sa. Jan. 17 | Taylor | <i>Facs.</i> |
| 343 | Sa. Jan. 29 | J.B. | ii. 271 |
| 344 | M. Feb. 7 London | " | ii. 272 |
| 345 | M. Feb. 7 | G. Steevens | ii. 273 <i>F.</i> |
| 346 | M. Feb. 21 | " | ii. 273 <i>F.</i> |
| 347 | Sa. March 5 | " | ii. 273 <i>F.</i> |
| 348 | Sa. March 5 | J.B. | ii. 274 |
| 349 | M. March 7 | (W. Strahan) | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 350 | F. March 11 | H.L.T. | <i>S. 1 : 7 : 30</i> |
| 351 | Thursday (? March, 1774) | " | <i>S. 15 : 2 : 32</i> |
| 352 | (About March 15) | J.B. | ii. 276 |
| 353 | W. March 30 | W. Hastings | <i>B.M.</i> |
| 353.1 | (1774) | Chambers | <i>Johnson House</i> |
| 353.2 | Sa. April 30 | Horne | <i>R.B.A.</i> |

1774—continued

| | | | |
|-------|---|--------------|-----------------------------|
| 354 | Tu. May 10 | J.B. | ii. 277 |
| 354.1 | Wednesday, May 25 (Wed.=23) | T. Cumins | R.B.A. |
| 355 | F. (27 May, 1774) | (J. B.) | (ii. 277) |
| 355.1 | F. May 27 | J. Scott | S. 5 : 12 : 16; not seen |
| 355.2 | Th. June 2 | " | R.B.A. |
| 356 | Tu. June 21 | J.B. | ii. 278 |
| 356.1 | Tu. June 28 | F. Reynolds | Colomb |
| 357 | M. July 4 | J.B. | ii. 279 |
| 358 | Tu. July 5 | Langton | ii. 280 F. |
| 359 | Tu. Aug. 16 Llewenny in Denbighshire | R. Levett | ii. 282 |
| 360 | Sa. Oct. 1 London | J.B. | ii. 284 |
| 360.1 | Th. Oct. 20 | Taylor | R.B.A. |
| 361 | Tu. Oct. 25 | Perkins | ii. 286 Perkins |
| 362 | Th. Oct. 27 | J.B. | ii. 287 |
| 362.1 | Sa. Nov. 19 | Lawrence | A.A.A. |
| 363 | Sa. Nov. 26 | J.B. | 4 : 5 : 33 |
| 364 | W. Nov. 30 | (W. Strahan) | ii. 288 |
| 365 | Tu. Dec. 6 | (Hollyer ?) | R.B.A. |
| 365.1 | Sa. Dec. 17 | H.L.T. | Ettinger |
| 366 | M. Dec. 19 | Hoole | Hudson |
| 367 | Tu. Dec. 20 London | W. Hastings | ii. 289 ; seen |
| 368 | Th. Dec. 22 | W. Strahan | iv. 69 |
| 369 | Th. Dec. 22 | Taylor | |
| 369.1 | Th. Dec. 29 | W. Hunter | R. College of Surgeons |

1775

| | | | |
|-------|----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| 370 | M. Jan. 2 | H.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18; not seen |
| 371 | Sa. Jan. 14 | J. B. | ii. 290 |
| 372 | Sa. Jan. 14 | Taylor | Lichfield |
| 373 | F. Jan. 20 | James Macpherson | ii. 298 R.B.A. |
| | J.B. did not see the original | | |
| 374 | Sa. Jan. 21 | J.B. | ii. 292 |
| 375 | Sa. Jan. 28 | " | ii. 294 |
| 376 | F. Feb. 3 | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18; not seen |
| 376.1 | Sa. Feb. 4 | Hector | S. 5 : 6 : 29 |
| 377 | Tu. Feb. 7 | Lawrence | ii. 296 |
| 378 | Tu. Feb. 7 | J.B. | ii. 296 |
| 378.1 | Th. Feb. 9 | Taylor | S. 31 : 3 : 75; not seen |
| 379 | (End of Feb. 1775) | H.T. | R.B.A. |
| 380 | Sa. Feb. 25 | J.B. | ii. 309 |
| 381 | W. March 1 | W. Strahan | R.B.A. |
| 382 | F. March 3 University College | " | " |
| 383 | F. March 3 University College | H.L.T. | " |
| 384 | M. March 6 | (? W. Strahan) | lost |
| 384.1 | M. March 6 | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18; not seen |
| 384.2 | W. March 8 | " | R.B.A. |
| 384.3 | March 23 | Hector | Ettinger |
| 385 | Su. 7 Id. Apr. (26 March) | T. Fothergill. | ii 333 |

JOHNSON'S LETTERS

157

1775—continued

| | | | |
|-------|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 385.1 | March 30 | (Wheeler) | |
| 386 | Sa. April 1 | H.L.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 386.1 | M. April 3 | H.L.T. | <i>Newton</i> |
| 387 | Sa. April 8 | Taylor | <i>Loyd</i> |
| 387.1 | Sa. April 8 | (Bentham) | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 387.2 | Th. April 13 | Taylor | " |
| 387.3 | Sa. April 15 | Wheeler | |
| 388 | M. April 17 | Langton | ii. 361 <i>F.</i> |
| 389 | Sa. May 6 | Macleod of Raasay | v. 412 |
| 389.1 | Sa. May 6 | H.T. | <i>S.</i> 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 389.2 | Tu. May 9 | H.L.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 390 | F. May 12 | " | <i>Clifton</i> |
| 391 | (May —) | T. Leland | lost |
| 392 | (May —) | Faulkner | lost |
| 393 | Sa. May 20 | H.L.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 394 | Su. May 21 | Langton | ii. 379 <i>F.</i> |
| 395 | M. May 22 | H.L.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 396 | W. May 24 | " | |
| 397 | Th. May 25 | " | J. E. Brown |
| 397.1 | F. May 26 | " | <i>S.</i> 5 : 5 : 30 |
| 398 | Sa. May 27 | J.B. | ii. 379 |
| 398.1 | Sa. May 27 | Taylor | <i>Buffalo P.L.</i> |
| 399 | Th. June 1 | H.L.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 400 | M. June 5 | " | <i>S.</i> 15 : 2 : 26 |
| 401 | Tu. June 6 | " | <i>S.</i> 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 402 | W. June 7 (misdated July) | " | seen |
| 403 | W. June 7 | " | <i>Lichfield</i> |
| 404 | Sa. June 10 | " | <i>S.</i> 30 : 1 : 18 not seen |
| 405 | Su. June 11 | " | |
| 406 | Tu. June 13 | Lichfield | <i>Folger</i> |
| 407 | Sa. June 17 | " | seen |
| 407.1 | Sa. June 20 | Lichfield | <i>Jeffery</i> |
| 408 | M. June 19 | Lichfield | <i>Lichfield</i> |
| 408a | n.d. (attached to 408 by H.L.P.) | " | " |
| 408.1 | M. June 19 | Lichfield | <i>Newton</i> |
| 409 | W. June 21 | Lichfield | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 410 | F. June 23 | " | <i>S.</i> 22 : 7 : 29 |
| 411 | M. June 26 | " | <i>S.</i> 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 412 | Th. June 29 | R. Green | lost |
| 413 | Sa. July 1 | Ashbourne | <i>S.</i> 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 414 | (July, 1775) | " | |
| 415 | Th. July 6 | Ashbourne | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 416 | Su. July 9 | Ashbourne | seen |
| 417 | Tu. July 11 | Ashbourne | <i>S.</i> 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 418 | W. July 12 | Ashbourne | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 419 | Th. July 13 | " | seen |
| 420 | Sa. July 15 | Ashbourne | seen |
| 421 | M. July 17 | " | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 422 | Th. July 20 | Ashbourne | <i>S.</i> 4 : 6 : 08 ; not seen |
| 423 | F. July 21 | Ashbourne | <i>R.B.A.</i> |

1775—continued

| | | | | |
|-------|--------------|-----------|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| 424 | M. July 24 | | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 ; 18 ; not seen |
| 425 | W. July 26 | Lichfield | " | R.B.A. |
| 426 | Sa. July 29 | | " | " |
| 427 | Tu. Aug. 1 | | " | " |
| 428 | W. Aug. 2 | Lichfield | " | Lichfield |
| 429 | Sa. Aug. 5 | Lichfield | " | Morgan |
| 430 | Sa. Aug. 5 | Lichfield | Mrs. Desmoulins | R.B.A. |
| 431 | Sa. Aug. 27 | London | J.B. | ii. 381 |
| 432 | Tu. Aug. 29 | | H.L.T. | Jeffery |
| 432.1 | W. Aug. 30 | | J.B. | ii. 384 ; over- looked by H. |
| 433 | Sa. Sept. 9 | London | Porter | seen |
| 434 | Sa. Sept. 9 | | Eliz. Aston | lost |
| 435 | Th. Sept. 14 | | J.B. | ii. 384 |
| 436 | M. Sept. 18 | Calais | R. Levet | ii. 385 |
| 437 | Su. Oct. 22 | Paris | " | ii. 385 |
| 438 | Th. Nov. 16 | | J.B. | ii. 387 |
| 439 | Th. Nov. 16 | | Porter | ii. 387 F. |
| 440 | Th. Nov. 16 | London | Taylor | Loyd |
| 441 | Th. Nov. 16 | Fleet St. | Hector | S. 5 : 6 : 29 |
| 442 | F. Dec. 15 | | Mrs. Montague | Croker |
| 443 | Su. Dec. 17 | | " | Jeffery |
| 444 | Dec. (23 ?) | | Porter | ii. 388 F. |
| 445 | Th. Dec. 21 | | Mrs. Montague | Princeton |
| 446 | Sa. Dec. 23 | | J.B. | ii. 411 |

1776

| | | | | |
|-------|----------------------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 447 | W. Jan. 10 | | J.B. | ii. 412 |
| 448 | M. Jan. 15 | | " | ii. 415 |
| 449 | M. Jan. 15 | London | Taylor | seen |
| 450 | Sa. Feb. 3 | | J.B. | ii. 416 |
| 451 | Tu. Feb. 6 | | J. Wesley | G.M. 1797 |
| 452 | F. Feb. 9 | | J.B. | ii. 419 |
| 453 | Tu. Feb. 13 | | A. Hamilton | S. 18 : 11 : 29 |
| 454 | Th. Feb. 15 (misdated '75) | | J.B. | ii. 420 |
| 455 | Sa. Feb. 17 | | Taylor | Loyd |
| 456 | M. Feb. 19 | | J. Calder | Nichols |
| 457 | Sa. Feb. 24 | | J.B. | ii. 422 |
| 458 | Tu. March 5 | | " | ii. 423 |
| 459 | W. March 6 | | J. Douglas | B.M. |
| 460 | Th. March 7 | | Hector | S. 5 : 6 : 29 |
| 461 | Th. March 7 | | Taylor | Morgan |
| 461.1 | Sa. March 9 | | Douglas | O. D. Young |
| 462 | Tu. March 12 | | J.B. | ii. 424 |
| 463 | Tu. March 12 | | Wetherell | ii. 424 |
| 463.1 | Sa. March 16 | | H.L.T. | |
| 464 | Sa. March 23 | Lichfield | Taylor | R.B.A. |
| 464.1 | Sa. March 23 | Lichfield | H.L.T. | Newton |
| 465 | M. March 25 | Lichfield | " | R.B.A. |
| 466 | Sa. March 30 | | " | Newton |
| 467 | M. April 1 | | " | R.B.A. |
| 468 | Th. April 4 | | " | " |
| 469 | Th. April 4 | 8, Bolt Court | Taylor | " |
| 470 | Tu. April 9 | | H.L.T. | " |
| 471 | Th. April 11 | | F. Reynolds | Colomb |
| 472 | Th. April 11 (?) | Bolt Court | Earl of Hertford | G.M. 1850 |

JOHNSON'S LETTERS

159

1776—continued

| | | | | |
|-------|------------------|--|--------------|------------------------------------|
| 473 | Sa. April 13 | Bolt Court (not Johnson's Court) | Taylor | <i>Webster</i> |
| 474 | M. April 15 | | F. Reynolds | <i>Colomb</i> |
| 475 | (April) | | J.B. | iii. 44 |
| 475.1 | c. 20 April | | Taylor | S. 31 : 3 : 75 ; not seen |
| 476 | M. May 6 | | H.L.T. | <i>Ettinger</i> |
| 477 | Sa. May 11 | | " | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 478 | Tu. May 14 | | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 479 | Th. May 16 | | " | <i>Bergson</i> |
| 480 | Th. May 16 | | J. Reynolds | iii. 81 F. |
| 481 | Th. May 16 | | Mrs. Boswell | iii. 85 |
| 482 | Sa. May 18 | | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 483 | W. May 22 | | " | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 483.1 | Th. May 23 | | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 484 | W. May 29 | | Adams | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 485 | M. June 3 | | H.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 486 | Tu. June 4 | | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 487 | W. June 5 | | " | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 488 | Th. June 6 | | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 489 | Sa. June 8 | | " | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 489.1 | Sa. June 15 | | F. Reynolds | <i>Colomb</i> |
| 490 | F. June 21 | | " | <i>B.M.</i> |
| 491 | Sa. June 22 | | J. Reynolds | iii. 82 F. |
| 491.1 | Sa. June 22 | | Langton | F. |
| 492 | Tu. June 25 | | Taylor | <i>Loyd</i> |
| 493 | Tu. July 2 | | J.B. | iii. 86 |
| 494 | Sa. July 6 | | " | iii. 88 |
| 495 | Th. July 11 | | F. Fowke | <i>Warner</i> , 1817 |
| 496 | Sa. Aug. 3 | | J. Reynolds | iii. 90 F. |
| 497 | Sa. Aug. 3 | | F. Reynolds | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 498 | Sa. Sept. 21 | | J. Ryland | <i>Marchbank</i> |
| 498.1 | M. Sept. 23 | | R. Levet | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 499 | M. Oct. 14 | | W. Strahan | seen |
| 500 | M. Oct. 21 | Brighthelmstone | R. Levet | iii. 92 |
| 500.1 | W. Oct. 30 | | Hoole ? | S. 15 : 2 : 32 |
| 501 | Th. Nov. 14 | | J. Ryland | |
| 502 | Sa. Nov. 16 | | J. B. | iii. 93 |
| 503 | Su. Dec. 1 | | Percy | <i>Dyce-Forster</i> |
| 504 | M. Dec. 2 (1776) | | " | |
| 504.1 | M. Dec. 16 | | " | not seen |
| 505 | Sa. Dec. 21 | | J.B. | iii. 94 |
| 505.1 | Tu. Dec. 24 | | W. Strahan | iii. 97 ; over- looked by H. F. |
| 505.2 | Tu. Dec. 24 | | Nollikens | F. |

1777

| | | | | |
|-------|--------------------|--|----------------|-----------------|
| 505.3 | Sa. Jan. 11 | | H.L.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 506 | Wednesday, Jan. 15 | | " | <i>"</i> |
| 506.1 | F. Jan. 17 ('77) | | Thomas Barnard | <i>Crawford</i> |
| 506.2 | Th. Jan. 23 | | Taylor | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 506.3 | Thursday Feb. 13 | | Langton | F. |

1777—continued

| | | | | |
|-------|--|------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| 507 | Tu. Feb. 18 | | J.B. | iii. 104 |
| 508 | Tu. Feb. 25 | | G. Steevens | iii. 100 |
| 509 | Sa. March 8 | Bolt Court | Eliz. Aston | <i>Croker</i> |
| 510 | Tu. March 11 | | J.B. | iii. 105 |
| 511 | Sa. March 15 | | Eliz. Aston | <i>Pembroke</i> |
| 512 | W. March 19 | | H.L.T. | <i>F. L. Harris</i> |
| 513 | W. April 9 | | H.T. | <i>S. 30:1:18</i> not seen |
| 514 | Sa. April 12 | | J. Ryland | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 515 | Sa. May 3 | | J.B. | iii. 108 |
| 516 | Sa. May 3 | | Taylor | <i>Morgan</i> |
| 517 | M. May 19 | | C. O'Connor | iii. 111 |
| 518 | M. May 19 | | H.L.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 519 | M. May 19 | | Taylor | <i>Loyd</i> |
| 519.1 | Monday (June) 2 (1777) | | H.L.T. | <i>S. 30:1:18;</i> not seen |
| 519.2 | W. June 11 | | " | <i>S. 30:1:18;</i> not seen |
| 519.3 | Tu. June 17 | | Allen | <i>Newton</i> |
| 520 | F. June 20 | | C. Jenkinson | iii. 145 |
| 521 | Su. June 22 | | Dodd | iii. 145 <i>Newton</i> |
| 521.1 | Su. June 22 | | Allen | <i>Newton</i> |
| 522 | Tu. June 24 | | J.B. | iii. 124 |
| 522.1 | W. June 25 | | Lady Harrington | <i>Newton</i> |
| 523 | Th. June 26 | | Dodd | iii. 147 |
| 524 | Sa. June 28 | | J.B. | iii. 120 |
| 525 | Su. June 29 | | Langton | iii. 124 <i>F.</i> |
| 526 | M. July 7 | Bolt Court | W. Sharp | iii. 126 |
| | <i>G.M. 1787—not to Dilly as J.B. said</i> | | | |
| 526.1 | M. July 7 | | Langton | <i>F.</i> |
| 527 | Sa. 19 July | | Vyse | iii. 125 |
| 528 | Tu. July 22 | | J.B. | iii. 127 |
| 529 | Tu. July 22 | | Mrs. Boswell | iii. 129 |
| 530 | Tu. July 22 | Bolt Court | R. Farmer | <i>Morgan</i> |
| 531 | Tu. July 22 | | Vyse | <i>Malone</i> |
| 531.1 | (? 1777) | | " | lost |
| 531.2 | Sa. July 26 | | Lawrence | <i>Tildesley</i> |
| 532 | Th. July 31 | | H.T. | |
| 533 | M. Aug. 4 | | H.L.T. | <i>S. 30:1:18;</i> not seen |
| 534 | M. Aug. 4 | Oxford | J.B. | iii. 130 |
| 535 | Th. Aug. 7 | Lichfield | H.L.T. | <i>Newton</i> |
| 536 | Sa. Aug. 9 | Lichfield | " | <i>Lichfield</i> |
| 537 | W. Aug. 13 | Lichfield | " | <i>Barrett</i> |
| 538 | Sa. Aug. 23 | Lichfield | " | <i>S. 6:12:04;</i> not seen |
| 539 | W. Aug. 27 | Lichfield | " | <i>Charmwood</i> |
| 539.1 | F. Aug. 29 (1777) | | Nollikens | <i>F.</i> |
| 540 | Sa. Aug. 30 | | J.B. | iii. 131 |
| 541 | M. Sept. 1 | Ashbourne | " | iii. 131 |
| 541.1 | Th. Sept. 4 | Ashbourne | H.M.T. | <i>Lansdowne</i> |
| 542 | Sa. Sept. 6 | | H.L.T. | <i>S. 30:1:18;</i> not seen |
| 543 | M. Sept. 8 | Ashbourne | " | <i>S. 15:2:26</i> |
| 544 | Th. Sept. 11 | Ashbourne | J.B. | iii. 135 |
| 545 | Sa. Sept. 13 | Ashbourne | H.L.T. | iii. 134 |
| 546 | Sa. Sept. 13 | Ashbourne | Eliz. Aston | <i>Pembroke</i> |
| 547 | M. Sept. 15 | | H.L.T. | |

JOHNSON'S LETTERS

161

1777—continued

| | | | | |
|-------|----------------|------------|---------------|------------------------------|
| 548 | Th. Sept. 18 | Ashbourne | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 549 | Sa. Sept. 20 | Ashbourne | " | R.B.A. |
| 550 | M. Sept. 22 | Ashbourne | " | " |
| 550.1 | Tu. Sept. 23 | | J.B. | Isham |
| 551 | Th. Sept. 25 | Ashbourne | H.L.T. | R.B.A. |
| 552 | Sa. Sept. 27 | Ashbourne | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 553 | Michaelmas day | Ashbourne | " | R.B.A. |
| 554 | M. Oct. 6 | Ashbourne | " | " |
| 555 | M. Oct. 13 | | " | " |
| 556 | Th. Oct. 16 | Ashbourne | " | Jeffery |
| 557 | W. Oct. 22 | Lichfield | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 558 | Sa. Oct. 25 | Lichfield | " | R.B.A. |
| 559 | M. Oct. 27 | Lichfield | " | " |
| 560 | W. Oct. 29 | Lichfield | " | Lichfield |
| 561 | M. Nov. 3 | Lichfield | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 561.1 | Th. Nov. 6 | Bolt Court | " | cancelled proof |
| 562 | M. Nov. 10 | | " | Newton |
| 563 | Th. Nov. 20 | London | Eliz. Aston | Pembroke |
| 564 | Th. Nov. 20 | London | Porter | R.B.A. |
| 565 | Tu. Nov. 25 | London | J.B. | iii. 210 |
| 565.1 | Tu. Dec. 16 | | T. Johnson | Clifton |
| 566 | Sa. Dec. 27 | Bolt Court | Mrs. Gastrell | Pembroke |
| 567 | Sa. Dec. 27 | | J.B. | iii. 214 |

1778

| | | | | |
|-------|--------------|------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| 568 | Sa. Jan. 24 | | J.B. | iii. 215 |
| 569 | W. Jan. 28 | | Cadell | |
| 570 | F. Jan. 30 | Bolt Court | — | |
| 571 | Tu. Feb. 3 | | Welch | iii. 217 |
| 572 | Th. Feb. 19 | | Porter | S. 17 : 3 : 30 |
| 573 | Th. March 5 | | Mrs. Montague | Huntington |
| 574 | F. March 6 | | " | Croker |
| 575 | Th. April 25 | | J.B. | iii. 277 |
| 576 | Th. April 30 | | H.L.T. | R.B.A. |
| 577 | F. May 15 | | M. Lowe | Examiner, 1873 |
| 578 | F. July 3 | London | J.B. | iii. 362 |
| 578.1 | Th. July 17 | Streatham | R. Clark | Guildhall |
| 579 | M. July 27 | | W. Strahan | iii. 364 |
| 580 | M. July 27 | | Elphinston | Memoirs, 1785 |
| 580.1 | (? 1778) | | J. Nichols | iv. 36 B.M.; overlooked by H. |
| 581 | M. July 27 | | " | B.M. |
| 581.1 | Sa. Aug. 29 | | Langton | F. |
| 581.2 | M. Aug. 31 | | (Cadell) | Johnson House |
| 582 | (Aug. 1778) | | J. Nichols | B.M. |
| 582.1 | Tu. Oct. 13 | | Lawrence | R.B.A. |
| 583 | Th. Oct. 15 | | H.L.T. | " |
| 584 | Sa. Oct. 17 | | Cadell | S. 10 : 5 : 75 ; not seen |
| 585 | Sa. Oct. 24 | London | H.L.T. | Newton |
| 585.1 | Sa. Oct. 24 | | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 586 | Sa. Oct. 31 | | H.L.T. | Bodleian |

1778—continued

| | | | |
|-------|----------------------|----------------|------------------------|
| 587 | Sa. Oct. 31 | Langton | iii. 365 F. |
| 588 | M. Nov. 2 London | Wheeler | iii. 366 |
| 589 | M. Nov. 2 London | Edwards | iii. 367 |
| 589.1 | Sa. Nov. 7 | W. Strahan | <i>Shorter</i> |
| 590 | M. Nov. 9 | H.L.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 591 | Sa. Nov. 14 | " | <i>Newton</i> |
| 592 | Sa. Nov. 21 | " | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 593 | Sa. Nov. 21 | J.B. | iii. 368 |
| 594 | Monday (23 Nov. '78) | J. Nichols | <i>B.M.</i> |
| 595 | Th. Nov. 26 | " | " |
| 596 | M. Dec. 7 | T. Fitzmaurice | <i>S. 21 : 12 : 28</i> |
| 597 | (Dec. 1778) | J. Nichols | <i>iv. 36 B.M.</i> |
| 598 | Th. Dec. 29 | J. Hussey | <i>iii. 369 D.N.S.</i> |

1779

| | | | |
|-------|---------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| 599 | Sa. Jan. 2 Bolt Court | Eliz. Aston | <i>Pembroke</i> |
| 600 | Sa. Jan. 2 Bolt Court | Porter | <i>S. 17 : 3 : 30</i> |
| 600.1 | Th. Jan. 21 Streatham | Mrs. Garrick | <i>S. 19 : 5 : 26 ;</i> <i>not seen</i> |
| 601 | Tu. Feb. 2 | " | <i>Facs.</i> |
| 602 | M. Feb. 15 | F. Reynolds | <i>Colomb</i> |
| 603 | M. March 1 | J. Nichols | <i>iv. 36 B.M.</i> |
| 604 | Th. March 4 | Eliz. Aston | <i>Pembroke</i> |
| 605 | Th. March 4 Bolt Court | Porter | <i>Pennant</i> |
| 606 | W. March 10 | H.L.T. | <i>Ettinger</i> |
| 607 | Sa. March 13 | J.B. | iii. 372 |
| 608 | Th. March 18 | H.L.T. | <i>S. 30 : 1 : 18 ;</i> <i>not seen</i> |
| 609 | Sa. April 3 | Cadell | <i>Newton</i> |
| 609.1 | F. April 9 | H.L.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 610 | M. April 26, 1779 Harley St. | J.B. | iii. 391 |
| 611 | Su. May 2 | J. Nichols | <i>iv. 36 B.M.</i> |
| 612 | M. May 3 | J. Wesley | iii. 394 |
| 613 | Tu. May 4 | Eliz. Aston | <i>S. 24 : 7 : 29</i> |
| 614 | Tu. May 4 | Porter | iii. 393 F. |
| 614.1 | Tu. May 4 | Taylor | <i>Harvard</i> |
| 615 | Th. May 20 | H.L.T. | <i>Rylands</i> |
| 616 | Sa. May 29 | " | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 616.1 | Th. June 10 Ashbourne | " | " |
| 617 | Sa. June 12 Ashbourne | " | " |
| 618 | M. June 14 Ashbourne | " | " |
| 618.1 | M. June 14 Ashbourne | Wetherell | <i>Huntington</i> |
| 619 | Tu. June 15 (misdated July) | H.T. | <i>Bergson</i> |
| 620 | Th. June 17 Ashbourne | H.L.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 620.1 | Th. June 17 | (Heberden) | <i>S. 5 : 5 : 30</i> |
| 621 | Sa. June 19 Lichfield | H.L.T. | <i>S. 30 : 1 : 18 ;</i> <i>not seen</i> |
| 622 | W. June 23 Lichfield | H.T. | <i>Newton</i> |
| 623 | Th. June 24 | H.L.T. | <i>S. 15 : 2 : 26</i> |
| 623.1 | Sa. June 26 Lichfield | " | <i>Charmwood</i> |
| 624 | Su. June 27 London | F. Reynolds | <i>Croker</i> |
| 625 | Tu. July 13 | C. Dilly | iii. 394 |
| 626 | Tu. July 13 | J.B. | iii. 395 |
| 627 | Tu. Aug. 3 | Taylor | <i>Loyd</i> |
| 627.1 | Tu. Aug. 24 (misdated 1777) London | Porter | " |
| 628 | Th. Sept. 9 Streatham | J.B. | iii. 396 |
| 629 | Monday, Oct. 4 | H.L.T. | <i>Bergson</i> |

JOHNSON'S LETTERS

163

1779—continued

| | | | |
|-------|--|--------------|------------------------------|
| 630 | Tu. Oct. 5 | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 631 | F. Oct. 8 London | " | R.B.A. |
| 632 | M. Oct. 11 London | " | Huntington |
| 633 | Sa. Oct. 16 | " | Bergson |
| 634 | Tu. Oct. 19 | F. Reynolds | S. 5 : 6 : 29 |
| 635 | Tu. Oct. 19 | Taylor | Loyd |
| 635.1 | Tu. Oct. 19 | Porter | not seen |
| 636 | Th. Oct. 21 | H.L.T. | seen |
| 636.1 | Th. Oct. 21 | F. Reynolds | Colomb |
| 637 | M. Oct. 25 | H.L.T. | Bergson |
| 638 | M. Oct. 25 | Eliz. Aston | Pembroke |
| 639 | W. Oct. 27 | J.B. | iii. 413 |
| 640 | Th. Oct. 28 London | H.L.T. | Ettinger |
| 640.1 | Su. Oct. 31 Bolt Court | Chambers | seen |
| 641 | Tu. Nov. 2 London | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 642 | Th. Nov. 4 London | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 643 | F. Nov. 5 Bolt Court | Eliz. Aston | Pembroke |
| 644 | Su. Nov. 7 London | H.L.T. | R.B.A. |
| 645 | M. Nov. 8 London | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 645.1 | Th. Nov. 11 London | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 646 | Sa. Nov. 13 London | J.B. | iii. 416 |
| 647 | Tu. Nov. 16 London | H.L.T. | Bergson |
| 648 | Sa. Nov. 20 London | " | F. L. Harris |
| 649 | Th. Dec. 2 | Porter | J.M. ii. 450 |
| 649.1 | Th. Dec. 9 | H.L.T. | S. 28 : 4 : 69 ; not seen |
| 649.2 | Sa. Dec. 25 | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 649.3 | Wednesday, Dec. 29 | " | " |
| 1780 | | | |
| 650 | Th. Jan. 20 | T. Lawrence | iii. 419 |
| | <i>Europ. Mag.</i> 1789 | | |
| 650.1 | F. Feb. 25 | ? Colman | S. 7 : 12 : 00 ; not seen |
| 651 | (1780) | (J. Nichols) | B.M. |
| 652 | (1780) | " | " |
| 653 | Friday | J. Nichols | " |
| 654 | Th. April 6 | H.L.T. | Newton |
| 655 | Sa. April 8 | J.B. | iii. 420 |
| 656 | Sa. April 8 | Porter | seen |
| 656.1 | Sa. April 8 | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 657 | Tu. April 11 London | H.L.T. | Newton |
| 658 | Sa. April 15 | " | R.B.A. |
| 659 | Tu. April 18 | " | Newton |
| 660 | Th. April 20 (misdated 1778) London | Taylor | seen |
| 660.1 | Th. April 20 (misdated 1778) | H.L.T. | R.B.A. |
| 661 | Wednesday (19 April, 1780) | C. Burney | |
| 661.2 | April 22 (? 1780) London | Porter | F. |
| 662 | Tu. April 25 London | H.L.T. | |
| 663 | M. May 1 London | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18 |
| 664 | Su. May 7 Bolt Court | " | not seen |
| 665 | M. May 8 Bolt Court | " | seen |

1780—continued

| | | | | |
|-------|---------------------------------|------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| 666 | Tu. May 9 | Bolt Court | H.L.T. | Lichfield |
| 667 | Tu. May 9 | Bolt Court | T. Warton | Croker |
| 667.1 | F. May 19 | Southwark | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 668 | Tu. May 23 | | J. Warton | Wooll |
| 669 | Tu. May 23 | | H.L.T. | S. 15 : 2 : 26 |
| 670 | (? May, 1780) | | (J. Nichols) | B.M. |
| 671 | May 24 (1780) | | | |
| 672 | Thursady, May 25 | Bolt Court | H.L.T. | " Bergson |
| 673 | Tu. May 23 | | R. Farmer | iii. 427 F. |
| 674 | Tu. May 30 | London | H.T. | Bergson |
| 675 | Tu. June 6 | Bolt Court | H.L.T. | Newton |
| 676 | Tu. June 6 | London | Taylor | E. Sadler |
| 677 | F. June 9 | London | H.L.T. | Lichfield |
| 678 | Sa. June 10 | | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18; not seen |
| 679 | M. June 12 | London | " | S. 4 : 6 : 08; not seen |
| 680 | W. June 14 | London | " | S. 4 : 6 : 08; not seen |
| 681 | Th. June 15 | London | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18; not seen |
| 682 | F. June 16 | Bolt Court | F. Reynolds | Colomb |
| | G.M. 1785 | | | |
| 683 | F. June 16 | | J. Nichols | B.M. |
| 684 | Wednesday, June 21 | | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18; not seen |
| 685 | Tu. July 4 | | " | Newton |
| 686 | M. July 10 | London | | |
| 686.1 | Th. July 13 | | R. Lowth | R.W.C. |
| 686.2 | Tu. July 18 | | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 687 | Th. July 27 | London | H.L.T. | R.B.A. |
| 688 | Th. July 27 | Bolt Court | Lord Westcote | Croker |
| 689 | F. July 28 | Bolt Court | | |
| 690 | Tu. Aug. 1 | London | H.L.T. | R.B.A. |
| 691 | Tu. Aug. 8 | | " | Huntington |
| 692 | M. Aug. 14 | | " | Newton |
| 693 | M. Aug. 14 | | Miss Prowse | seen |
| 694 | | | J. Nichols } one | B.M. |
| 695 | | | " } letter | |
| 696 | | | " | " |
| 697 | | | " | " |
| 698 | Wednesday (Aug. 16, 1780) | | " | " |
| | The above letters all G.M. 1785 | | | |
| 699 | F. Aug. 18 | | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18; not seen |
| 699.1 | Friday, 18 Aug. | | Lawrence | |
| 700 | M. Aug. 21 | Bolt Court | Beattie | iii. 434 |
| 701 | M. Aug. 21 | London | J.B. | iii. 435 |
| 702 | Th. Aug. 24 | London | H.L.T. | R.B.A. |
| 703 | F. Aug. 25 | London | " | |
| 703.1 | M. Aug. 28 | London | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 704 | W. Aug. 30 | Bolt Court | C. Lawrence | iii. 436 |
| 705 | Sa. Sept. 9 | Bolt Court | Lady Southwell | Malone |
| 706 | W. Sept. 13 | | W. Strahan | S. 19 : 4 : 18; not seen |
| 706.1 | (? Sept. 1780) | | Lord North | |
| 707 | Sa. Sept. 23 | Bolt Court | S. Hardy | |

JOHNSON'S LETTERS

165

1780—continued

707.1 M. Oct. 16 H.L.T.
 708 Tu. Oct. 17 J.B.
 709 Th. Oct. 26 (Brighthelm- J. Nichols
 stone)
 710 Sa. Dec. 9 Miss Prowse
 711 Sa. Dec. 30 Vyse
 711.1 (1780) Allen

iii. 441
 B.M.

seen
 Malone
 R.B.A.

1781

712 M. Jan. 29 W. Hastings
 712.1 Th. March 1 Bolt Court Lord Lucan

iv. 70 B.M.
 Morning
 Herald,
 8 June, 1792
 R.B.A.

713 M. March 5 W. Strahan
 714 M. March 5 Cadell
 715 W. March 14 J.B.
 716 Wednesday (4 April, 1781) J. Reynolds
 717 Th. April 5 H.L.T.
 718 Sa. April 7 "
 719 M. April 9 London (Vyse)
 720 Tu. April 10 Bolt Court H. L. T.
 721 W. April 11 London
 722 Th. April 12 London "
 723 Th. April 12 London Porter
 724 Sa. April 14 (1781) H.L.T.
 725 M. April 16 "
 726 Monday, 16 April (1781) J. Nichols

Clifton
 iv. 89 F.
 R.B.A.
 seen
 B.M.

G.M. 1785
 727 Tu. April 17 London H.L.T.
 727.1 Tu. April 17 —
 (=727) (? 1781)

R.B.A.
 not seen

727.2 Th. April 19 H.M.T.
 728 M. April 23 Mrs. Strahan
 729 M. May 7 Bolt Court Miss Prowse
 729.1 Sa. May 12 London Taylor
 729.2 May 1781 J. Nichols
 729.3 Tu. May 22 H.L.T.
 729.4 M. May 28 "
 730 Sa. June 2 Perkins
 730.1 Sa. June 9 London Porter
 731 Su. June 10 J. Nichols
 732 Sa. June 16 Bolt Court Langton
 733 Sa. June 23 J. Reynolds
 734 M. June 25 F. Reynolds
 735 M. July 2 (Perkins)
 736 M. July 9 F. Burney
 737 Tu. July 17 Astle

Lansdowne
 iv. 100 F.
 seen
 O. D. Young
 B.M.
 Rylands
 N.L.S.
 iv. 118 Perkins
 S. 15 : 4 : 29
 B.M.
 iv. 132 F.
 iv. 133
 Colomb

G.M.
 738 Sa. July 21 F. Reynolds
 738.1 M. Aug. 6 Perkins
 739 M. or T. Sept. 24 or 25 Bolt T. Patten
 Court

Diary
 iv. 133

Malone
 Perkins
 G.M. 1819

739.1 M. Sept. 24 London Taylor
 739.2 M. Oct. 8 Perkins
 740 M. Oct. 15 M. Lowe
 740.1 M. Oct. 15 (Porter)
 741 W. Oct. 17 H.L.T.

B.M.
 Perkins
 R.B.A.
 Ettinger
 S. 30 : 1 : 18 ;
 not seen

| 1781—continued | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| 742 | Sa. Oct. 20 | Lichfield | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 743 | Tu. Oct. 23 | Lichfield | " | R.B.A. |
| 744 | Sa. Oct. 27 | " | " | Bergson |
| 745 | W. Oct. 31 | Lichfield | " | R.B.A. |
| 746 | Sa. Nov. 3 | Lichfield | " | S. 11 : 2 : 29 |
| 746.1 | W. Nov. 7 | Lichfield | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 747 | Sa. Nov. 10 | Ashbourne | H.L.T. | F. L. Harris |
| 748 | M. Nov. 12 | Ashbourne | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 749 | W. Nov. 14 | Ashbourne | " | |
| 750 | Sa. Nov. 24 | Ashbourne | " | S. 4 : 6 : 08 ; not seen |
| 751 | M. Nov. 26 | Ashbourne | Allen | Croker |
| 751.1 | W. Nov. 28 | Ashbourne | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 752 | M. Dec. 3 | Lichfield | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 753 | Sa. Dec. 8 | Birmingham | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 754 | W. Dec. 26 | | J. Nichols | B.M. |
| | G.M. 1785 | | | |
| 754.1 | Wednesday (1781) | | Wesley | R.B.A. |
| 1782 | | | | |
| 755 | Tu. Jan. 1 | | M. Lowe | lost |
| 756 | Sa. Jan. 5 | | J.B. | iv. 136 |
| 756.1 | Sa. Jan. 5 | | H.L.T. | |
| 756.2 | Sa. Jan. 5 | | Lawrence | Huntington |
| 756.3 | Su. Jan. 6 | | H.L.T. | Rylands |
| 757 | Th. Jan. 17 | | Lawrence | iv. 137 ; seen |
| 757.1 | M. Jan. 21 (1782) | | " | Huntington |
| 758 | M. Jan. 28 | | H.L.T. | S. 5 : 5 : 30 |
| 758.1 | Jan. 1782 | Bolt Court | — | |
| 758.2 | Tu. Jan. 29 | | Perkins | Perkins |
| 759 | M. Feb. 4 | | Mrs. Strahan | iv. 140 F. |
| 759.1 | M. Feb. 4 | | Lawrence | |
| 759.2 | Sa. Feb. 9 | | Mrs. Chapone | Castle Howard |
| 760 | Th. Feb. 14 | | R. Beatmiffe | |
| 761 | Sa. Feb. 16 (? 18) | | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 762 | Su. Feb. 17 | | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 763 | Th. Feb. 21 | Bolt Court | " | R.B.A. |
| 764 | W. Feb. 27 | | Malone | iv. 141 R.B.A. |
| 765 | Sa. March 2 | London | Porter | iv. 142 F. |
| 766 | Sa. March 2 (sic) | | Malone | iv. 141 R.B.A. |
| 766.1 | Sa. March 2 | | Taylor | |
| 766.2 | W. March 13 | | Lawrence | Huntington |
| 767 | Th. March 14 | | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 767.1 | Th. March 14 | | Taylor | S. 5 : 6 : 29 |
| 767.2 | F. March 15 | | Lawrence | Huntington |
| 767.3 | Sa. March 16 | | H.L.T. | Rylands |
| 767.4 | M. March 18 | | Burney | S. 22 : 12 : 19 ; not seen |
| 768 | Tu. March 19 | Bolt Court | Porter | iv. 142 F. |
| 769 | Tu. March 19 | | Eliz. Aston | lost |
| 770 | W. March 20 | Bolt Court | Langton | iv. 145 F. |
| 771 | Th. March 21 | Bolt Court | Hector | iv. 146 F. |

JOHNSON'S LETTERS

167

1782—continued

| | | | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|------------------|---|
| 772 | Aug. 28 (1782) | Hector | iv. 147 F. |
| 773 | F. March 22 | Taylor | lost |
| 774 | F. March 22 | W. G. Hamilton | lost |
| 775 | Th. March 28 London | J.B. | iv. 148 |
| 776 | Sa. March 30 Bolt Court | Gastrell & Aston | <i>Pembroke</i> |
| 777 | M. April 8 | F. Reynolds | <i>Colomb</i> |
| 778 | W. 24 or Th. 25 April (1782) | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 779 | Tu. April 30 | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 779.1 | W. May 1 | T. Lawrence | iv. 143 ; over- looked by H.; <i>Huntington</i> |
| 779.2 | Th. May 2 | H.L.T. | <i>Newton</i> |
| 779.3 | Sa. May 4 | | <i>Perkins</i> |
| 779.4 | Tu. May 7 | Perkins | <i>Rylands</i> |
| 779.5 | Tu. May 7 | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 780 | W. 8 May | H.L.T. | <i>Rylands</i> |
| 780.1 | Th. 9 May | " | iv. 150 |
| 781 | W. 15 May | Rev. — | i. 214 |
| 782 | M. 20 May | Kearsly | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 782.1 | Tu. 21 May | H.L.T. | S. 28 : 5 : 82 ; not seen |
| 783 | M. 27 May | — | |
| 784 | Tu. 28 May | — | |
| 785 | M. 3 June London | J.B. | iv. 151 |
| 786 | Tu. 4 June London | H.L.T. | seen |
| 787 | Tu. 4 June Bolt Court | Miss Prowse | |
| 787.1 | W. 5 June | H.L.T. | <i>Ettinger</i> |
| 787.2 | W. 5 June | " | <i>Rylands</i> |
| 787.3 | F. 7 June | " | <i>Murdock</i> |
| 788 | Saturday, 8 June (misdated July) | | |
| 788.1 | Su. 9 June | Eliz. Lawrence | |
| 789 | Tu. 11 June Oxford | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18 not seen |
| 789.1 | Tu. 11 June Oxford | R. Jebb | |
| 790 | W. 12 June Oxford | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 791 | Th. 13 June Oxford | " | <i>Tildesley</i> |
| 791.1 | Th. 13 June Oxford | Taylor | S. 31 : 3 : 75 ; not seen |
| 792 | M. 17 June Oxford | H.L.T. | seen |
| 792.1 | Tu. 2 July | Eliz. Lawrence | |
| 793 | M. 8 July London | Taylor | <i>Loyd</i> |
| 793.1 | M. 8 July | Richard Chambers | S. 17 : 3 : 30 |
| 794 | M. 22 July | Eliz. Lawrence | iv. 144 ; seen |
| 795 | M. 22 July London | Taylor | <i>Loyd</i> |
| 796 | Su. 28 July | Perkins | iv. 153 <i>Perkins</i> |
| 797 | Su. 4 Aug. London | Taylor | <i>Nat. Lib.</i> <i>Scotland</i> |
| 798 | M. 12 Aug. London | | <i>Morgan</i> |
| 798.1 | M. 12 Aug. | (? Malone) | <i>Bodley</i> |
| 799 | Sa. 17 Aug. | Taylor | seen |
| 800 | M. 19 Aug. | G. Strahan | seen |
| 801 | Sa. 24 Aug. | J.B. | iv. 153 |
| 802 | M. 26 Aug. | Eliz. Lawrence | iv. 144 <i>R.B.A.</i> |

1782—continued

| | | | |
|-------|--|--------------|--------------------------------|
| 803 | Sa. 7 Sept. London | J.B. | iv. 154 |
| 804 | Sa. 7 Sept. (really 7 Dec.) London | Mrs. Boswell | iv. 156 |
| 805 | Late Sept. | J.B. | iv. 155 |
| 806 | Sa. 21 Sept. | Taylor | |
| 806.1 | Th. 3 Oct. | P. Metcalf | iv. 160; over- looked by H. |
| 807 | Th. 3 (misdated 4) Oct. | Taylor | Loyd |
| 808 | Su. 6 Oct. | Compton | Malone |
| 809 | Th. 10 Oct. Brighthelm- stone | G. Strahan | seen |
| 810 | Th. 10 Oct. Brighthelm- stone G.M. 1784 | Nichols | iv. 161 B.M. |
| 811 | Tu. 22 Oct. | Lowe | R.B.A. |
| 811.1 | W. 23 Oct. | Bowles | Ettinger |
| 811.2 | Th. 24 Oct. | Compton | Harvard |
| 811.3 | Th. 24 Oct. | W. Strahan | Morgan |
| 812 | M. 28 Oct. G.M. 1784 & 1785 | Nichols | iv. 161 B.M. |
| 812.1 | Saturday, 9 Nov. | H.L.T. | |
| 813 | Th. 14 Nov. Brighthelm- stone | J. Reynolds | iv. 161 F. |
| 814 | Th. 14 Nov. Brighthelm- stone | W. Strahan | R.B.A. |
| 814.1 | Sa. 30 Nov. | H.L.T. | Rylands |
| 814.2 | Tu. 3 Dec. | Perkins | Perkins |
| 804 | Sa. 7 Dec. See above. | | |
| 815 | Sa. 7 Dec. London | J.B. | iv. 156 |
| 815.1 | Sa. 7 Dec. London | Taylor | |
| 815.2 | Sa. 7 Dec. | R. Clerk | |
| 816 | M. 9 Dec. London | Taylor | Facs. |
| 817 | W. 11 Dec. | W. Strahan | seen |
| 817.1 | Monday, 16 Dec. | H.L.T. | Rylands |
| 817.2 | Tu. 17 Dec. | " | " |
| 817.3 | W. 18 Dec. | " | " |
| 818 | F. 20 Dec. | " | seen |
| 818.1 | Sa. 21 Dec. | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 819 | Th. 26 Dec. | J. Reynolds | S. 26 : 7 : 22 ; not seen |
| 819.1 | Th. 26 Dec. | H.L.T. | Rylands |
| 819.2 | M. 30 Dec. | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 820 | Tu. 31 Dec. | T. Wilson | iv. 162 |
| 821 | Tu. 31 Dec. | Taylor | Loyd |

1783

| | | | |
|-------|--------------------|------------|---------------------------------|
| 821.1 | F. 3 Jan. | Bowles | R.B.A. |
| 821.2 | W. 8 Jan. | Perkins | Perkins |
| 822 | F. 10 Jan. 1783 ? | Nichols | B.M. |
| 823 | Th. 16 Jan. London | Taylor | Loyd |
| 824 | Thursday, 16 Jan. | G. Strahan | seen |
| 825 | (? Jan. 1783) | " | seen |
| 825.1 | F. 17 Jan. | H.L.T. | Rylands |
| 826 | M. 20 Jan. | Cradock | seen |
| 826.1 | M. 20 Jan. | " | " |
| 827 | Tu. 21 Jan. | Taylor | Loyd |
| 827.1 | c. 4 Feb. | J.B. | iv. 163 ; over- looked by H. |

JOHNSON'S LETTERS

169

1783—continued

| | | | | |
|-------|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| 828 | Tu. 4 Jan. | Bolt Court | Eliz. Lawrence | iv. 144 <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 828.1 | M. 10 Jan. | | H. Croft | <i>B.M.</i> |
| 828.2 | Monday 17 (? Feb. or March, 1783) | | H.M.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 829 | W. 19 Feb. | | J. Reynolds | <i>R.W.C.</i> |
| 830 | Tu. 4 March | | W. " Scott | <i>Crabbe</i> , 1807 |
| 831 | T. 4 March | | H.L.T. | lost |
| 831.1 | Su. 23 March | | " | <i>Rylands</i> |
| 831.2 | Su. 30 March | | " | " |
| 831.3 | M. 31 March | | " | " |
| 832 | Sa. 12 April | | J. Reynolds | iv. 201 |
| 833 | Sa. 12 April | | J. Barry | iv. 202 |
| 833.1 | c. 12 April | | Porter | iv. 203 ; over- looked by H. |
| 833.2 | W. 16 April (1783) | | Cadell | <i>Huntington</i> |
| 834 | Sa. 19 April | | Fowke | <i>Warner</i> , 1817 |
| 835 | Sa. 19 April | Bolt Court | Mercers' Co. | <i>Malone</i> |
| 835.1 | Sa. 19 April | Bolt Court | Chambers | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 835.2 | W. 23 April | | — | <i>S. 17 : 12 : 28</i> |
| 836 | F. 25 April | | Dartmouth | <i>Hist. MSS.</i> |
| 836.1 | Sa. 26 April | London | H.M.T. | <i>Comm.</i> |
| 837 | Th. Mayday | London | H.L.T. | <i>Lansdowne</i> |
| 838 | Sa. 3 May | | J. Reynolds | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 839 | Th. 8 May | London | H.L.T. | iv. 219 |
| 839.1 | Th. 22 May | London | H.M.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 840 | Sa. 24 May | | Wilkes | <i>Lansdowne</i> |
| 841 | Sa. 31 May | London | Windham | <i>B.M.</i> |
| 842 | M. 2 June | | J. Reynolds | iv. 227 <i>F.</i> |
| 843 | M. 2 June | | — | iv. 227 <i>F.</i> |
| 843.1 | M. 2 June | London | H.M.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 844 | W. 4 June | Bolt Court | A. Hamilton | <i>Lansdowne</i> |
| 845 | Th. 5 June | London | H.L.T. | <i>Croker</i> |
| 846 | F. 13 June | London | " | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 847 | Tu. 17 June | | Allen | <i>S. 30 : 1 : 18 ;</i> |
| 848 | Tu. 17 June | | Taylor | not seen |
| 849 | W. 18 June | | T. Davies | iv. 228 |
| 850 | Th. 19 June | Bolt Court | H.L.T. | iv. 228 <i>Loyd</i> |
| 851 | F. 20 June | London | " | iv. 231 |
| 852 | F. 20 June | | M. Lowe | <i>Bergson</i> |
| 853 | Sa. 21 June | London | H.L.T. | <i>Jeffery</i> |
| 854 | M. 23 June | London | " | <i>Croker</i> |
| 855 | Tu. 24 June | London | " | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 856 | W. 5 June | London | Porter | " |
| 857 | Sa. 28 June | London | H.L.T. | <i>Chequers</i> |
| 858 | M. (30 June, 1783) | | " | seen |
| 859 | Tu. 1 July | London | " | seen |
| 860 | Th. 3 July | London | " | <i>O. D. Young</i> |
| 861 | Th. 3 July | London | J.B. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 862 | Sa. 5 July | London | Porter | " |
| 863 | Sa. 5 July | London | H.L.T. | iv. 231 |
| 864 | c. 5 July | | Susannah Thrale | iv. 232 <i>F.</i> |
| 865 | Tu. 8 July | London | H.L.T. | seen |
| 865.1 | Tu. 8 July | London | J. Ryland | <i>Lansdowne</i> |
| 866 | F. 11 July | | — | seen |
| 867 | Tu. 15 July | Rochester | W. Strahan | <i>Jeffery</i> |
| | | | | <i>Puttick</i> 16 7 : |
| | | | | 66 ; not seen |
| | | | | <i>Bemis</i> |

1783—continued

| | | | | |
|-------|---------------------------|------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| 868 | Tu. 15 July | | A. Williams | lost |
| 869 | W. 23 July | London | H.L.T. | seen |
| 869.1 | Th. 24 July | London | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 870 | Th. 24 July | London | Sophia Thrale | |
| 871 | Th. 24 July | | Taylor | Loyd |
| 871.1 | Th. 24 July | London | J. Ryland | R.B.A. |
| 871.2 | Th. 24 July | | Bowles | " |
| 872 | Sa. 26 July | London | Susannah Thrale | Lansdowne |
| 873 | W. 30 July and W. 6 Aug. | | Cruikshank | iv. 240 F. |
| 874 | Tu. 9 Sept. & Th. 9 Oct. | | J. Mudge | iv. 240 F. |
| 875 | W. 13 Aug. | London | H.L.T. | Newton |
| 875.1 | Su. 17 Aug. | | ? J. Reynolds | Cotton, 1859 |
| 875.2 | M. 18 Aug. | | F. Reynolds | Ettinger |
| 876 | W. 20 Aug. | London | H.L.T. | R.B.A. |
| 876.1 | Sa. 23 Aug. | London | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 876.2 | Su. 24 Aug. | | F. Reynolds | Croker |
| 876.3 | M. 25 Aug. | | Bowles | R.B.A. |
| 877 | Tu. 26 Aug. | London | H.L.T. | Hudson |
| 878 | F. 29 Aug. | Heale | Brocklesby | iv. 234 F. |
| 879 | W. 3 Sept. | Heale | Taylor | Loyd |
| 879.1 | W. 3 Sept. | Heale | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 879.2 | Sa. 6 Sept. | Heale | J. Reynolds | F. |
| 880 | Tu. 9 Sept. | | Susannah Thrale | " |
| 881 | Tu. 16 Sept. | Heale | F. Barber | R.B.A. |
| 882 | Th. 18 Sept. | | C. Burney | iv. 239 |
| 883 | M. 22 Sept. | London | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 884 | M. 22 Sept. | | Mrs. Montague | R.B.A. |
| 884.1 | Tu. 23 Sept. | | H.L.T. | Rylands |
| 884.2 | Tu. 23 Sept. | Bolt Court | J. Mudge | F. |
| 885 | W. 24 Sept. | | Taylor | R.B.A. |
| 885.1 | W. 24 Sept. | | Cruikshank | F. |
| 886 | Sa. 20 Sept. | London | Langton | iv. 240 F. |
| 887 | W. 24 Sept. & Sa. 11 Oct. | | " | iv. 241 F. |
| 888 | Tu. 30 Sept. | | J.B. | iv. 241 |
| 888.1 | Tu. 30 Sept. | London | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 888.2 | Tu. 30 Sept. | London | Bowles | Ettinger |
| 889 | W. 1 Oct. | | F. Reynolds | Croker |
| 890 | W. 1 Oct. | | Tomkeson | " |
| 890.1 | Th. 2 Oct. | | Cruikshank | Loyd |
| 891 | M. 6 Oct. | London | H.L.T. | seen |
| 892 | Th. 9 Oct. | London | " | R.B.A. (part) Rylands (part) |
| 893 | M. 20 Oct. | London | Taylor | R.B.A. |
| 893.1 | M. 20 Oct. | London | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 894 | Tu. 21 Oct. | London | H.L.T. | |
| 894.1 | Th. 23 Oct. | | F. Reynolds | R.B.A. |
| 895 | M. 27 Oct. | London | H.L.T. | S. 6 : 12 : 04 ; not seen |
| 896 | M. 27 Oct. | London | F. Reynolds | Croker |
| 896.1 | Tu. 28 Oct. | | Miss Wesley | Life of W. |
| 897 | Sa. 1 Nov. | London | H.L.T. | Bergson |
| 898 | M. 10 Nov. | Bolt Court | Porter | Malone |
| 898.1 | M. 10 Nov. | | Taylor | S. 4 : 12 : 16 ; not seen |
| 899 | Tu. 11 Nov. | Bolt Court | (R. Jackson) | seen |
| 900 | Th. 13 Nov. | London | H.L.T. | R.B.A. |
| 901 | Tu. 18 Nov. | | Susannah Thrale | Lansdowne |

JOHNSON'S LETTERS

171

1783—continued

| | | | | |
|-------|------------------|------------|--------------|---|
| 902 | W. 19 Nov. | Bolt Court | F. Burney | <i>Murdock</i> |
| 903 | Saturday | | " | |
| 904 | W. 19 Nov. | London | Taylor | <i>Morgan</i> |
| 905 | W. 19 Nov. | Bolt Court | Hamilton | iv. 245 <i>F.</i> |
| 906 | Th. 20 Nov. | London | H.L.T. | |
| 906.1 | Th. 20 Nov. | London | Mrs. Chapone | <i>Castle Howard</i> |
| 907 | Sa. 22 Nov. | London | Taylor | <i>Loyd</i> |
| 908 | Sa. 22 Nov. | Bolt Court | Hawkins | <i>Hawkins, 1787</i> |
| 909 | M. 24 Nov. | London | H.L.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 910 | Th. 27 Nov. | London | " | <i>S. 30 : 1 : 18 ;</i> <i>not seen</i> |
| 910.1 | Th. 27 Nov. | London | F. Reynolds | <i>Croker ; seen</i> |
| 911 | F. 28 Nov. | | Mrs. Chapone | iv. 247 <i>Castle Howard</i> |
| 912 | Sa. 29 Nov. | London | H.L.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 913 | Sa. 29 Nov. | London | Taylor | <i>Christie 5 : 6 :</i> <i>88 ; not seen</i> |
| 914 | Sa. 29 Nov. | London | Porter | iv. 256 <i>F.</i> |
| 914.1 | M. 1 Dec. | | H.L.T. | <i>Rylands</i> |
| 915 | W. 3 Dec. (1783) | | Hawkins | <i>Hawkins, 1787</i> |
| 915.1 | W. 3 Dec. (1783) | | Cruikshank | <i>F.</i> |
| 916 | Th. 4 Dec. | | J. Reynolds | iv. 253 <i>F.</i> |
| 916.1 | F. 5 Dec. | | Perkins | <i>Perkins</i> |
| 916.2 | M. 8 Dec. | | F. Reynolds | <i>Colomb</i> |
| 917 | Sa. 13 Dec. | London | H.L.T. | <i>seen</i> |
| 918 | Sa. 20 Dec. | London | Taylor | <i>seen</i> |
| 918.1 | Sa. 20 Dec. | London | H.M.T. | <i>Lansdowne</i> |
| 919 | Tu. 23 Dec. | | F. Reynolds | <i>seen</i> |
| 920 | W. 24 Dec. | London | J.B. | iv. 248 |
| 921 | Sa. 27 Dec. | London | H.L.T. | <i>seen</i> |
| 922 | W. 31 Dec. | London | " | <i>C. S. Lewis</i> |

1784

| | | | | |
|-------|------------------|------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| 923 | Sa. 3 Jan. | London | Taylor | <i>seen</i> |
| 923.1 | M. 5 Jan. | | Perkins | <i>Perkins</i> |
| 924 | Tu. 6 Jan. | Bolt Court | C. Dilly | iv. 257 <i>F.</i> |
| 924.1 | Su. 11 Jan. | | Perkins | |
| 925 | M. 12 Jan. | London | H.L.T. | <i>seen</i> |
| 925.1 | W. 14 Jan. | | Bowles | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 926 | W. 21 Jan. | London | H.L.T. | " |
| 927 | W. 21 Jan. | | Perkins | iv. 257 <i>Perkins</i> |
| 927.1 | F. 23 Jan. | | " | <i>Perkins</i> |
| 928 | Sa. 24 Jan. | London | Taylor | iv. 260 <i>Huntington</i> |
| 929 | Tu. 27 Jan. | Bolt Court | R. Clark | iv. 258 <i>F.</i> |
| 929.1 | Sa. 31 Jan. | London | H.M.T. | <i>Lansdowne</i> |
| 929.2 | Tu. 3 Feb. | | Bowles | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 929.3 | W. 4 Feb. (1784) | | Nichols | <i>S. 18 : 11 : 29</i> |
| 930 | F. 6 Feb. | Bolt Court | Heberden | |
| 931 | M. 9 Feb. | London | H.L.T. | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 931.1 | M. 9 Feb. | | F. Reynolds | <i>Colomb</i> |
| 932 | W. 11 Feb. | | J.B. | iv. 259 |
| 933 | W. 11 Feb. | Bolt Court | A. Hamilton | <i>Croker</i> |
| 933.1 | F. 13 Feb. | | Cruikshank | <i>F.</i> |
| 934 | Tu. 17 Feb. | Bolt Court | Mrs. Rogers | <i>seen</i> |
| 934.1 | Tu. 17 Feb. | | A. Hamilton | <i>Croker</i> |
| 934.2 | Tu. 17 Feb. | | Cruikshank | <i>F.</i> |

1784—continued

| | | | | |
|----------------|-------------------------------|------------|------------------|---|
| 935 | M. 13 Feb. | | Porter | iv. 261 F. |
| 935.1 | M. 23 Feb. | London | Bowles | R.B.A. |
| 936 | F. 27 Feb. | London | J.B. | iv. 261 |
| 937 | Tu. 2 March | London | " | iv. 262 |
| 938 | W. 10 March | London | H.L.T. | Hudson |
| 939 | W. 10 March | Bolt Court | Porter | Jeffery |
| 940 | Th. 11 March | | Gastrell & Aston | Pembroke |
| 941 | Tu. 16 March | London | H.L.T. | R.B.A. |
| 942 | Th. 18 March | London | J.B. | iv. 264 |
| 943 | Sa. 20 March | London | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 944 | Th. 25 March | London | Susannah Thrale | Lansdowne |
| 945 | Sa. 27 March | London | Langton | iv. 267 F. |
| 946 | Tu. 30 March | London | J.B. | iv. 265 |
| 946.1 | Tu. 30 March | Bolt Court | Adams | Hyett |
| 946.2 | Su. 4 April | Bolt Court | Mrs. Lewis | S. 29 : 3 : 22 ; not seen |
| 947 | M. 5 April | | Humphrey | iv. 268 Ettinger |
| 947.1 | M. 5 April | | Bowles | R.B.A. |
| 948 | Th. 8 April | London | Langton | iv. 267 F. |
| 949 | Tu. 13 April (misdated in B.) | | Humphrey | iv. 369 R.B.A. |
| 950 | M. 12 April | | Nichols | G.M. 1788 |
| 951 | Easter Monday, 12 April | London | Taylor | iv. 270 Loyd |
| 951.1 | M. 12 April (1784) | | F. Reynolds | |
| 952 | Tuesday, 13 April | | Langton | iv. 268 F. |
| 952.1 | Tu. 13 April | Bolt Court | Portmore | iv. 268 ; over- looked by H. F. |
| 952.2 | Tu. 13 April | | Perkins | Perkins |
| 953 | Th. 15 April | London | H.L.T. | Newton |
| 954 | M. 19 April | London | " | F. L. Harris |
| 955 | W. 21 April | London | " | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 955.1 | Su. 25 April (1784) | | Sastres | J.M. ii. 454 |
| 956 | M. 26 April | London | H.L.T. | S. 30 : 1 : 18 ; not seen |
| 957 | M. 26 April | London | Porter | Malone |
| 958 | F. 30 April | Bolt Court | F. Reynolds | Colomb |
| 959 | M. 10 May | | Jenny Langton | iv. 271 ; seen |
| 960 | Thursday, 13 May | London | H.L.T. | seen |
| 960.1 | Tu. 25 May | | — | Morgan |
| 961 | F. 28 May | | F. Reynolds | Colomb |
| 962 | M. 31 May | | Humphrey | iv. 269 ; S. 10 : 5 : 75 ; not seen |
| 963 | M. 31 May | London | H.L.T. | seen |
| 963.1 | M. 31 May | Bolt Court | Adams | R.B.A. |
| 964 | Tu. 1 June | | J. Reynolds | iv. 283 F. |
| 965 | W. 2 June | | A. Hamilton | Croker |
| 965.1 | Th. 3 June | London | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 965.2 | M. 7 June | Oxford | Allen | R.B.A. |
| 965.3 | Tu. 8 June | | G. Nicol | Johnson House |
| 965.4 | Tu. 8 June | Oxford | Taylor | O. D. Young |
| 973 } 974 } | (11 June) misdated | | | See 973 below |
| 966 | Th. 17 June | London | H.L.T. | seen |
| 967 | Sa. 19 June | Bolt Court | Taylor | |

JOHNSON'S LETTERS

173

1784—continued

| | | | |
|--------|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 968 | Wednesday, 23 June | Taylor | Huntington |
| 969 | Sa. 26 June London | H.L.T. | seen |
| 969.1 | Th. 1 July London | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 970 | F. 2 July | H.L.T. | R.B.A. |
| 970.1 | Sa. 3 July London | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 970.2 | Tu. 6 July London | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 971 | Th. 8 July Bolt Court | J. Reynolds | iv. 348 F. |
| 972 | Th. 8 July London | H.L.T. | seen |
| 972.1 | Th. 8 July London | Porter | S. 15 : 4 : 29 |
| 972.2 | Sa. 10 July | Bowles | R.B.A. |
| 973 | Su. 11 July (misdated June) | J.B. | iv. 351 |
| 974 | Su. 11 July London | Adams | Morgan |
| 975 | M. 12 July Bolt Court | T. Bagshaw | iv. 351 Isham |
| | J.B. kept a copy | | |
| 976 | M. 12 July London | Langton | iv. 352 F. |
| 977 | M. 12 July | J. Ryland | R.B.A. |
| 978 | ? (July, 1784) | Hawkins | Hawkins, 1787 |
| 979 | M. 12 July Ashbourne | Brocklesby | iv. 353 F. |
| 980 | W. 21 July Ashbourne | J. Reynolds | iv. 366 F. |
| 981 | M. 26 July Ashbourne | J.B. | iv. 348, 378-9 |
| 982 | W. 28 July | " | iv. 379 |
| 983 | Sa. 31 July Ashbourne | Brocklesby | iv. 354 F. |
| 983.1 | Sa. 31 July Ashbourne | Porter | F. |
| 984 | M. 2 Aug. | C. Burney | iv. 360; seen |
| 985 | Th. 5 Aug. Ashbourne | Brocklesby | iv. 354 F. |
| 986 | Sa. 7 Aug. Ashbourne | Hoole | iv. 359 |
| 987 | Th. 12 Aug. Ashbourne | Brocklesby | iv. 354 F. |
| 988 | Th. 12 Aug. Ashbourne | Heely | iv. 371 F. |
| 988.1 | Th. 12 Aug. Ashbourne | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 989 | 13 Aug. (? 31 Aug., P.M. is —S.E.) | Hoole | iv. 359 R.B.A. |
| 990 | Sa. 14 Aug. Ashbourne | Brocklesby | iv. 354 F. |
| 991 | Sa. 14 Aug. | T. Davies | iv. 365 |
| 991.1 | Sa. 14 Aug. | Porter | Loyd |
| 992 | M. 16 Aug. Ashbourne | Brocklesby | iv. 354 F. |
| 992.1 | M. 16 Aug. Ashbourne | W. Strahan | Shorter |
| 993 | Th. 19 Aug. Ashbourne | Brocklesby | iv. 355 F. |
| 994 | Th. 19 Aug. Ashbourne | G. Nicol | iv. 365 |
| 995 | Th. 19 Aug. Ashbourne | J. Reynolds | iv. 366 F. |
| 996 | c. 20 Aug. Ashbourne | Windham | iv. 362 F. |
| 997 | Sa. 21 Aug. Ashbourne | Brocklesby | iv. 355 F. |
| 998 | Sa. 21 Aug. Ashbourne | Sastres | Piozzi |
| 998.1 | M. 23 Aug. Ashbourne | C. Burney | S. 15 : 2 : 26 ; |
| | | | S. 18 : 2 : 31 |
| 999 | Th. 26 Aug. Ashbourne | Langton | iv. 361 F. |
| 1000 | Th. 26 Aug. | Brocklesby | iv. 356 F. |
| 1001 | Th. 2 Sept. Ashbourne | " | iv. 356 F. |
| 1001.1 | M. 30 Aug. Ashbourne | Brocklesby | F. |
| 1002 | Th. 2 Sept. Ashbourne | J. Reynolds | iv. 366 F. |
| 1003 | Th. 2 Sept. Ashbourne | Sastres | Piozzi |
| 1003.1 | Th. 2 Sept. Ashbourne | J. Ryland | |
| 1003.2 | Th. 2 Sept. Ashbourne | H.M.T. | Lansdowne |
| 1004 | Sa. 4 Sept. | C. Burney | iv. 360 |
| 1005 | Sa. 4 Sept. Ashbourne | Cruikshank | iv. 365 F. |
| 1006 | Sa. 4 Sept. | Hoole | iv. 360; seen |
| 1006.1 | Sa. 4 Sept. | King's Librarian | R.B.A. |
| 1007 | Th. 9 Sept. Ashbourne | J. Reynolds | iv. 348, 367 |
| | | | R.B.A. |

1784—continued

| | | | | |
|--------|------------------------|------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| 1008 | Th. (9) Sept. | | Thurlow | iv. 349 <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 1009 | Th. 9 Sept. | Ashbourne | Brocklesby | iv. 357 <i>F.</i> |
| 1010 | Sa. 11 Sept. | Ashbourne | " | iv. 357 <i>F.</i> |
| 1010.1 | Sa. 11 Sept. | Ashbourne | Porter | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 1011 | Th. 16 Sept. | Ashbourne | Brocklesby | iv. 357 <i>F.</i> |
| 1012 | Th. 16 Sept. | Ashbourne | Sastres | <i>Piozzi</i> |
| 1012.1 | Th. 16 Sept. | Ashbourne | D. Berkeley | <i>Ettinger</i> |
| 1013 | Sa. 18 Sept. | Ashbourne | J. Reynolds | iv. 368 <i>F.</i> |
| 1014 | Sa. 18 Sept. | | J. Ryland | |
| 1015 | W. 29 Sept. | Lichfield | Brocklesby | iv. 357 <i>F.</i> |
| 1016 | W. 29 Sept. | Lichfield | Ryland | <i>Christie</i> 5 : 6 |
| | | | | 88 ; not seen |
| 1016.1 | Th. 30 Sept. | | W. Strahan | <i>Shorter</i> |
| 1017 | Sa. 2 Oct. | Lichfield | Windham | iv. 362 <i>F.</i> |
| 1018 | Sa. 2 Oct. | Lichfield | J. Reynolds | iv. 368 |
| | | | | <i>Harvard</i> |
| 1018.1 | Sa. 2 Oct. | Lichfield | Mrs. Garrick | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 1019 | M. 4 Oct. | Lichfield | Perkins | iv. 363 <i>Perkins</i> |
| 1020 | W. 6 Oct. | Lichfield | Brocklesby | iv. 358 <i>F.</i> |
| 1021 | W. 6 Oct. | Lichfield | Ryland | seen |
| 1022 | W. 13 Oct. | Lichfield | Heberden | |
| 1023 | Sa. 16 Oct. | Lichfield | G. Strahan | <i>Ettinger</i> |
| 1023.1 | Sa. 16 Oct. | Lichfield | W. Strahan | <i>Shorter</i> |
| 1024 | W. 20 Oct. | Lichfield | Hamilton | iv. 363 <i>F.</i> |
| 1025 | W. 20 Oct. | Lichfield | Paradise | iv. 364 <i>F.</i> |
| 1026 | W. 20 Oct. | Lichfield | J. Nichols | iv. 369 <i>B.M.</i> |
| 1027 | W. 20 Oct. | Lichfield | Sastres | <i>Piozzi</i> |
| 1027.1 | W. 20 Oct. | | Taylor | <i>S.</i> 31 : 3 : 75 ; |
| | | | | not seen |
| 1027.2 | W. 20 Oct. | Lichfield | Brocklesby | <i>F.</i> |
| 1028 | Sa. 23 Oct. | Lichfield | " | seen |
| 1029 | M. 25 Oct. | Lichfield | Brocklesby | iv. 358 <i>F.</i> |
| 1029.1 | M. 25 Oct. | | Perkins | <i>Perkins</i> |
| 1029.2 | Sa. 30 Oct. | | J. Ryland | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 1030 | M. 1 Nov. | | C. Burney | iv. 361 |
| 1031 | M. 1 Nov. | Lichfield | Sastres | <i>Piozzi</i> |
| 1032 | Th. 4 Nov. | Lichfield | J. Ryland | <i>R.B.A.</i> |
| 1033 | F. 5 Nov. (not 3 Nov.) | Lichfield | J.B. | iv. 380 |
| 1033.1 | Sa. 6 Nov. | Lichfield | Brocklesby | <i>F.</i> |
| 1034 | Su. 7 Nov. | Lichfield | Hawkins | <i>Hawkins</i> , 1787 |
| 1035 | (Nov. 1784) | | Gastrell & Aston | <i>Pembroke</i> |
| 1036 | W. 17 Nov. | | C. Burney | iv. 377 ; Facs. |
| | | | | in H. |
| 1037 | W. 17 Nov. | London | Hector | iv. 378 <i>F.</i> |
| 1037.1 | Sa. 27 Nov. | Bolt Court | (Hollyer) | |
| 1038 | (Nov. 1784) | | Cadell | <i>Ettinger</i> |
| 1039 | M. 29 Nov. | Bolt Court | Vyse | <i>Malone</i> |
| 1039.1 | M. 29 Nov. | | W. Strahan | <i>Shorter</i> |
| 1039.2 | M. 29 Nov. | | Langton | <i>S.</i> 25 : 11 : 29 |
| 1040 | Th. 2 Dec. | | R. Green | iv. 393 |
| 1041 | Th. 2 Dec. | | Porter | iv. 394 <i>F.</i> |
| 1042 | M. 6 Dec. | | J. Nichols | <i>B.M.</i> |
| 1042.1 | Tu. 7 Dec. | | W. Strahan | <i>O. D. Young</i> |
| 1042.2 | F. 10 Dec. | | " | <i>Shorter</i> |
| 1043 | (a) 20 Sept. | | Mrs. Strahan | (a) seen |
| | (b) 29 Nov. | | — | 10 : 5 : 75 ; |
| | | | | not seen |

UNDATED LETTERS NOT YET CONJECTURALLY PLACED

I. To Mrs. Thrale

- 4 Feb n.y. About Dr. Worthington, Hoole and others.
S. 30 : 1 : 18. Not seen.
- 8 March n.y. Mentions Baretti, Wetherel and others.
S. 4 : 6 : 82. Not seen.
- 27 March n.y. "You have now been at court, your presentation was delayed too long."
S. 30 : 1 : 18. Not seen.
- 21 May n.y. "I have now got more books."
R.B.A.
- 26 May n.y. About illness and visits.
S. 30 : 1 : 18. Not seen.
- Saturday n.d. "I long to come to that place which my dear Friends allow me to call Home."
S. 30 : 1 : 18. Not seen.
- n.d. (Dec. 1774). "The King fell to reading the book as soon as he got it."
Lichfield.
- n.d. "Mr. Johnson will wait for dear Mrs. Thrale to-morrow."
Cecil Tildesley.
- Tuesday n.d. "Mr. Johnson is much obliged by Mrs. Thrale's inquiry. He came home on Saturday."
R.B.A.
- n.d. "Vous me chargez hier."
Rosenbach Co. (1925).
- n.d. "Qu'il vous plaise, Madame."
The late Sir Charles Russell.
- n.d. "There are many Ups and Downs in the world."
Hudson.
- n.d. Mentions Steevens and Shebeare.
S. 30 : 1 : 18. Not seen.
- n.d. A draft about Carter.
S. 30 : 1 : 18. Not seen.

II. To others.

- Burke. See Stockdale.
- Cadell. 31 May. "Mr. Johnson desires Mr. Cadell to send him *Duty of Man*."
n.d. "I shall be glad to see you and Mr. Nicol." R.B.A.
- Chambers. ? 8 Oct. R.B.A.
- Davies, T. *Life*, iv. 231, overlooked by Hill.
- Franklin. "Dr. Johnson presents best compliments to Governor and Mrs. Franklin."
- Hawkesworth. 20 Jan. "You may by chance remember. . . Epitome of Chambers' Dictionary."
- Hoole (not Hooke). (1) "Mr. Johnson has heard from Mr. Barrington."
(2) "Mr. Johnson returns thanks."
- Jones, Griffith. 9 Oct. "You are accustomed to consider advertisements."
J.M. ii. 454.
- Langley, W. "A long continuance of ill-health."
- Lawrence, T. "Mr. Johnson has sent the volumes." R.B.A.
- 14 June. "I have enclosed some account of your Son."
- Moore (Hannah More). "I will wait on Mrs. Garrick and you on Friday."
- Nichols. (1) "Mr. Johnson desires the favour of Mr. Nichols' company."
(2) "Mr. Johnson is going to tea."
(3) "Mr. Johnson wishes that Mr. Nichol could favour him for an hour with the Drummer."
(4) "Mr. Nichol in desire (*sic*) to procure."
- Orrery, Lord. See Mr. Adam's Catalogue.
- Percy. "If you can spare *Amadis*." J.M. ii. 441.

- Perkins. 24 Jan. "I am sorry for you all."
 n.d. "I have sent a receipt."
 4 Apr. "Mr. Johnson sends compliments."
 3 Feb. "Mr. Johnson expected Master Perkins's."
 Reynolds, F. (1) "This is my letter." J.M. ii. 455
 (2) "I have not been at Mrs. Thrale's." *Soc. of Antiquaries*.
 Reynolds, J. Asking Sir Joshua to read a book. Thorpe Catalogue, 1838.
 Sastres. 25 April. "I am very much displeased with myself."
 Huntington.
 Smart, Mrs. In *Poems*, 1791. *Life*, iv. 358, overlooked by Hill.
 Stockdale, P., stated that he had a letter from J., and that J. also wrote to Burke
 about him. *Memoirs*, i. xix; ii. 128.
 Strahan, W. (?). 29 Nov. "Alter one word only."
 This is 1043 (b).
 Warton. "I wish you had given me notice." Morgan.
 Unknown Correspondents :
 (1) "I have not yet seen the Doctor."
 (2) "Mr. Johnson is this day engaged to the Bishop of Dromore."
 (3) 12 April. "Dear Madam, I am not yet able to wait on you."

THE NOCTES AMBROSIANÆ, AND JAMES HOGG

By ALAN LANG STROUT

(continued)

3. Hogg's Knowledge of the Classics

In treating Hogg's knowledge of the classics, Wilson frankly allows his humour to run away with his consistency. So early as the pre-*Noctean* *The Tent* of September, 1819, the Oxford collegian Seward mystifies the Shepherd by quoting Greek and Latin poems; and later in the same number Dr. Parr's Greek and Latin epitaph on the dog Hector mystifies him still more. In the second of the regular *Noctes* in which he appears, moreover, Hogg is confused by Greek, as well as by French and Latin. Yet in the twelfth number of October, 1823, he mentions "Homer and Horace, and Polydore Virgil," and in the fourteenth number of April, 1824, he actually quotes Latin on two occasions: "Ohe! jam satis," and "Eheu! fugaces, Posthume, Posthume, labuntur anni!" (All told, he quotes or recognizes quotations from the Latin nine times and even on one occasion himself quotes Greek.) Remembering the communal character of the early *Noctes*, one may not feel surprise at the contradictions noted; but these inconsistencies continue throughout the rest of the series. In May, 1834, for example, Hogg announces, "I hae been studyin' the Greek for twa wunters . . . I hae completed a version o' Theocritus, and Bion, and Moschus—no to mention Anacreon. . . ." A moment later he recites for the company "the third Eedle" of Bion. Yet in the last *Noctes*, that of February, 1835, after North and Tickler have both repeated Latin expressions, the Shepherd says resignedly, "You're twa classical scholars, and wull aye be quottin' Greek."

Just as the inn-keeper Ambrose—who writes poetry and who, in the early days, occasionally contributed to *Maga*—gives the title of Aristotle's *Poetics* in the original Greek, repeats to North half a dozen lines from *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, quotes Latin phrases five

times, and yet confuses Southey and Sotheby, thinks Nestor a god, and calls "vaccination" "vacillation," so Hogg quotes a line from Horace in the original, but a few pages later in the same number confuses *Cryptogamia*, scientific term for a vegetable classification, for the name of a place, in highly amusing fashion. Again, in June, 1824, when Odoherty ends a speech with the Latin expression "bibimus indocti doctique," Hogg says, "Jeering at me, I daursay"; and when Tickler recites a passage from the Greek, he says again, "Hech, sirs! what's a' this rumbleterow?—what's ailing Mr. Tickler?" Yet in February, 1826, he mentions the Greek "Dionysius Harlicarnensis": "I ken a' about him frae Tennant o' Dollar, author of Anster Fair"—and when Tickler proposes Tennant's health and the health of his new tragedy *John Baliol*, the Shepherd answers, "With all my heart; but I wish people would give over writing tragedies. If they won't, then let them choose tragical subjects; let them, as Aristotle says in his Poetics, purge our souls by pity and terror, and not set us asleep." In the next number of April, likewise, he compares North's voice to Socrates', just as in the following number of June he compliments Tickler by telling him that, as a doctor, he would have felt a pulse "wi' a true Esculawpian solemnity," and later in the same number calls Theocritus "the Allan Ramsay o' Sicily, as I hae heard; and the best pastoral poet o' the ancient world." Elsewhere he exclaims, "What for will clever chaps, wi' a classical education, aye be writin' awa at sangs about us shepherds? Havers! Let Burns, and me, and Allan Cunningham talk o' kintra matters, under our own charge."

(a) *His range*.—In his *Lay Sermons* of 1834 the real Hogg writes, "Save by translations, I am altogether unacquainted with the exquisite beauties which are to be found in the writings of the ancients. . . . In all that regards ancient literature, I am not entitled to say a word." The same thought receives more rhapsodical utterance in the *Noctes* when, in October, 1826, the Shepherd asserts, "I canna read Greek—except in a Latin translation done into English . . . but I ken pieces, fragments o' their glorious history, Pope's Homer, West's Pindar, and stray strains o' Plato, a poet in prose; I have heard as in an echo the thunder o' Demosthenes, have seen casts o' marble statues of their gods and demigods and godlike men. . . ."

If we trust the *Noctes* we feel that he has indeed mastered his "translations." He shows an acquaintance with Cincinnatus,

he considers himself "as dumb's Diogenes," he refers to "what Cicero called urbanity," he mentions Cæsar's *Commentaries*, and "Sawlust," and "Anawcreon," and Socrates and Homer four times each. Upon the overflow of the haggis in December, 1828, he carries North to safety: "I'm like the pious Æneas bearin' his father Ancheeses through the flames o' Troy." When North mentions the *Prometheus* of Æschylus, Hogg gives a good résumé of the hero's situation in that play; elsewhere he agrees with the English Opium-Eater that to call the dwellers of Edinburgh "Modern Athenians" is "hanged nonsense": "Whare's Pericles? No the Provost. . . . Whare's Eskluss, Yourippidays, and Suffoclaes?" He recognizes the story of Demosthenes on the seashore and the impediment in his speech, and when North assumes the appearance of Lord Eldon in the *Noctes* of March, 1829, he assures Tickler, "He stauns like a statue o' Demosthenes, about to utter the first word o' ane o' his Philippics." Again, ". . . But what signifies a skull? The shell of the flown bird, said Simonides, a pensive poet of old—for whose sake would that I could read Greek—though I fancy there are o' him but some sma' and uncertain remains." "So said Scipio of Hannibal," he observes to Tickler on one occasion; on another he refers to the pedant lecturing Hannibal on war; on still another he cries, "What a bloody beatin' Galgacus gied Agricola!" He refers to Seneca and quotes Vespasian: "Wha's this that bled himsell to death in a bath? Was na't Seneca?" "Teetus Vespawsian used to say sometimes—'I have lost a day.'" He accuses contemporary poetasters of "drinkin' Hippocrene and Helicon, twa kinds o' Greek wine, ance red, but noo tawny; and though no like to flee to the head, yet apt to soor sair on an empty stamach." Even his toes remind him of a flight of steps leading up to the portico of a Grecian temple. And on at least two occasions he shows an acquaintance with the Latin language. "Isna a Roman sodger a Glawdiator?" he triumphantly asks Tickler. "Does na the verra word, Glawdiawtor, come frae the Latin for swurd?" Again, when North quotes,

O fortunati nimium! sua si bona norint
Sumphiculi!

the worthy Shepherd chides him sharply, "I doubt, sir, if you hae ony authority for the formation o' that diminutive. Let's hae gude Latin, or nane." Some of the most amusing passages in the *Noctes*

Ambrosianæ occur in the dialogues between Hogg and De Quincey, men of obviously disparate character. The Shepherd's admiration of the Opium-Eater appears sufficiently in the following compliment, taken from the number of June, 1830 :

Plawto por'd out his pheelosophy in dialogues—and sae, sir, do you—and I'll back ye again' the auld Trojan—that is, Grecian—for a barrel o' eisters. I never understood metafeezics afore—but noo the distinction atween reason and imagination and their objects, is as plain as that atween the pike-staff o' a sergeant o' militia and the sceptre o' Agamemnon.

"I ken as muckle about the heathen mythology as Barry Cornwall does," boasts the Shepherd in the nineteenth *Noctes* of March, 1825 ; "but wha ever hears me taking ony of their names in vain ? It's a great sign o' weakness in ony poet o' the present day to be rinnin' awa back to antiquity, when there's sae strong a spirit of life hotchin' ower yearth and sea in this very century." Here again the speaker hardly realizes the extent of his sins ; he has taken, and he will take in the next fifty numbers, many a mythological name in vain.

He mentions the "Seabellin' leaves," and the Gordian knot, and the Cretan "Labarenth," and the Macedonian phalanx ; and Elysium, and "Arcawdia," and Helicon, and Parnassus ; and "the bright birds o' Venus," and "the secular bird o' ages," the phœnix ; and the Graces and the Muses, and satyrs and mermaids, and riding like a Centaur, and "soomin' a ford like a Naiad." He speaks of the "bonny . . . classical fable" of the Hesperides ; "Preserve us," he says, "if Mr. Hooie's no stannin' on his head yet—like ane o' the Antipodes" ; and when North confides to him that the German language "is gradually lightening up before my eyes—" he interrupts with the remark, "Like the *Mare Ignotum* before the een o' a navigator in a ship sailin' intil the dawn." He mentions also Hector and "Asteeanax," and Achilles, and Stentor, and Ulysses. He speaks of "dark-haired, bricht-eed night . . . frightenin' that bit puir timid lassie the Dawn out o' her seven senses" ; he exclaims on one occasion, "Blatter awa', Rain ! thou cloud-begotten son o' Uranus !" and on another, "Hecate a beauty ! I aye thocht she had been a furious fricht-black-a-vised, pockey-ort, wi' a great stool o' a beard." Upon North's observing that "Memory . . . was called the mother of the muses," he says, "Sae, indeed, she was—Mymoshuny

[Mnemosyne]"; he refers to Hercules as "Puir son o' Alknomook [Alcmene]";¹ he knows that Saturn "devoured his weans"; and he describes the action of his cow Crummie in classical fashion when he says, "She brak oot o' the byre, as if stung by a gadflee, or some divine cæstrum." On ten occasions he mentions Apollo, once "as he druve his chariot along the Great Turnpike Road o' Heaven"; again, "In the ancient warld, was na there but æ god for poetry, music, and medishin? and the ancients, tak my word for't, saw far intill the mysterious connexions o' things in Natur"; and again, sublime example of his egotism, he speaks of a poet being laid in the cradle by Apollo and tended by the nine muses—"nine nurses, and nae less—which o' them wat and which o' them dry it's no easy for me at this distance o' time to remember." Only once does he err, when he confuses "Chiron" with "Charon," and perhaps that was a matter of pronunciation.

(b) *Words*.—R. P. Gillies tells us that the real Hogg's particular friends included James Gray, one of the masters of the high school in Edinburgh and an excellent Greek scholar:

Truly zealous for the honour and fame of the Shepherd, Gray wished him to read and study, as well as to write, and directed his attention to the fact that Shakspeare, though risen from the station of a link-boy, and self-educated, became possessed of extensive acquirements and learning. But James Hogg was obdurate in his contempt for books, whether old or new. Not even the example of Shakspeare, nor the exaggeration of the implied compliment, could propitiate him. He would work out his own reveries upon the "sclate," after his own fashion, and that was all. Nevertheless, he took up by rote divers of Gray's Latin phrases, and in his prose writings used to table them at haphazard.

Gillies definitely overstates the haphazard appearance of Latin phrases in Hogg's writings, so far, at least, as I have been able to judge from a rapid skimming of his prose works, but it is possible that the Shepherd did carry over into his conversation various expressions, at second hand, from Gray. One is struck in the *Noctes*, at any rate, by over fifty such expressions, Latin and other, which Wilson puts into the mouth of his character. Some humour appears in the use of these phrases on occasion, as when Hogg calls "beef

¹ In Anne Home's "Cherokee Indian Death Song," A. Cunningham's *The Songs of Scotland* (1825), 4, 156, each stanza ends with some variation of the line: "For the son of Alknomook will never complain." The pun on Alknomook and Alcmene would be appreciated by a contemporary.

d-la-mode . . . North's *feu-de-joy*," or when he says, "*intus et in cute*—that is, tooth and nail."

In his writings, again, the real James Hogg employs words with comic ineptitude. Saintsbury quotes an example from Hogg's *Memoir*: "The next year I published *The Confessions of a Fanatic* . . . I do not remember ever receiving anything for it, and I am sure if there had been a reversion (he means return) I should have had a moiety." In *The Editor's Narrative* or preface to this story, moreover, Hogg uses the expression "an unguent hard to be swallowed," and in one of his latest poems he writes,

"I wish all blustering chaps were dead,
That's the true bathos to be done with them."

"He did not know the meaning of unguent or bathos," Miss Edith Batho points out, "but they were good words." In the *Noctes* the Shepherd constantly confuses words. So early as the *Twelfth of August*, 1819, he does not distinguish between "elegy" and "eulogy"; in *The Tent* of September, 1819, he calls "rostrum" "nostrum." In later numbers he twice calls "species" "specie"; he uses "statutes" for "statues," "anecdotes" for "antidotes," "theorem" for "theory," "antiseptic" for "antiseptic," a word which he employs apparently for "preservative." He thinks North when he mentions "acoustics" means "cow steaks," that when he refers to "Turgot and Galileo" he means "Turkey and Galilee." On one occasion he sets a-moralizing:

Words that have the same soun' ought to have the same sense—though, I admit, that's no aye the case—for itherwise language misleads. For example, only yestreen at a party, a pert, prim, pompous prater, wi' a peerie-weerie expression about the een, asked me what I thoct, in this stormy state of the atmosphere, would become of the Peers? I answered, simply aneuch, that if wrapped up in fresh straw, and laid in a dry place, safe frae the damp, they would keep till Christmas. The cretur, after haen said something, he supposed, insupportably severe on me for the use o' feegurative language on sic a terrible topic, began to what he ca'd "impune ma opinion," and to grow unco foul-mouthed on the Duke of Wellington. I thought o' Saughton Ha'; but that painfu' suspicion was soon removed from ma mind, for I fand he was speakin' o' the Peers in Parliament, and me o' jargonells.

Another passage in the Shepherd's long soliloquy at the beginning of the number of January, 1828, as he ruminates on the comforts of

the "sonsie sofa" where he sits, amusingly illustrates also his attitude towards words :

The leanest o' human kind wud fin' itself saft and plump, on, or rather in, sic a settee, for there's nae kennin' the seat frae the thing sittin', and ane's amalgamated, to use a chemical word, corporeally wi' the cushions, and part and parcel o' the fringed furniture o' a room fit to be the Sanctum Sanctorum o' the Spirit o' Sardanapalus after Apotheosis. Sae intense is the luxury, that it gars me unawares use lang-nebbed classical words, in preference to my mither tongue, which seems ower puir-like and impovereshed for gien adequate expression to a voluptuousness that laps my spirit in an Oriental Elysium.

In less exalted mood he asks De Quincey on one occasion, "My dear sir, is it ane o' the idiosyncrasies o' your constitution—(that lang-nebbed word I committed to memory the nicht frae the recitation o' the Modern Pythagorean [Macnish])—to get ill at thunner?" ; and on another, when North starts a sentence, "The idiosyncrasies—" he interrupts him with the exclamation, "What a lang-nebbed polysyllable!" Again,

Shepherd. It's a curious fact, sir, o' my idiosyncrasy—

North. Your what, James?

Shepherd. Na—catch me, after gettin' safely through a word o' sax syllables, tryin' the adventure again the same nicht. But it's a curious fact o' my peculiar conformation o' character. . . .

It must be confessed that the Shepherd's love of "lang-nebbed classical words" frequently leads him astray, as when he speaks of "a musical cognocenti" and "a phenomena," coins the plural "Nocteses," tautologically refers to "four-footed quadrupeds" and "an extemporaneous imprompty," assumes that "pastigeos" [pasticcios] mean "pigeon-pies," and calls himself "an improveesi-streecky" [apparently "improvisatrice," feminine of "improvisatore"]. Even less subtly, on various occasions, Wilson has the other speakers confuse the Shepherd by their use of long words.

Tickler. Where learned you the natatory art, my dear Shepherd?

Shepherd. Do you mean soomin'? In St. Mary's Loch.

Again,

North [after examining the Shepherd's burned tongue]. A slight incipient inflammation not worth mentioning.

Shepherd. I houp an incipient inflammation's no a dangerous sort?

But though he confuses words, and though long words lead him astray, the Shepherd, in his command of English, shows his usual

combination of knowledge and ignorance. Thus, to take only a dozen examples, he correctly uses such words as comatose, soporific, sublunary, umbrageous, obliquity, noxious, pedantic, pragmatism, schism, sorites, circumbendibus, and expiscated. Yet he is at pains to explain that "transverse" means "cross," that "Iris" means "rainbow," and that "Proboscis is the Latin for the mouth o' a bee"; he amusingly misuses "anonymous," and wishes to know from North the meaning of "posthumous." Upon North's observing, "I am a Monogamist," he inquires, "And what's that—may I ask?" Again when North remarks, "I have tried to solve the problem, James, empirically," he answers, "It's lucky you've used that word the noo, sir; for though I see't in every serious wark, I canna say I attach to it any particular meaning."

As has already been shown in the consideration of "idiosyncrasy," the Shepherd on occasion may give a legitimate word a peculiar twist of his own. Thus Tickler once expresses the opinion that silence at an after-dinner table may become "absolutely louder than thunder."

Shepherd. That's a maist insane solecism, Mr. Tickler. That a negative quantity should hae the power o' the square rute o' an infinite series o' incalculable nummers! . . .

Modern Pythagorean. The idea that such silence is louder than thunder—so far from being, my beloved Shepherd, an insane solecism (an expression, by the way, dark with the unintelligibility of true genius)—seems to me, Mr. Tickler, rather to fall short than to transcend the feeling of such a moment. . . .

Examples of Hogg's "insane solecisms" appear in his use of such unidiomatic or colloquial expressions as, ". . . Till you become a Defunct," and, when angry, "You've raised my corruption," or in his use of "anachronism," by which he apparently means "slip" or "error." Most individually striking, perhaps, is his use of the word "apothegm." "In his every-day converse," R. Shelton Mackenzie informs us, "Hogg was fond of frequently using the word *apothegms*, and the various ways in which I have heard him apply it always made me doubt whether he distinctly knew its exact meaning." Tickler slyly hits off his friend's fondness for the word in an early number when he places Byron "immediately behind the all but Homeric magician of the North, and the all but Miltonic prophet of the Lakes. There's my apophthegm—for that, I think, Jemmy, is your name for anything you don't understand."

Altogether, we are inclined to agree with the Shepherd's own admission when he employs the word "anomaly," "I like a word I dinna weel understaun'."

A word may be said, in conclusion, concerning Hogg's pronunciation, and his use of the Scotch dialect.

Since we know, fortunately, from Robert Carruthers, that the real James Hogg pronounced "chimera" "shimmera,"¹ we may guess that Wilson follows pretty closely the pronunciation of the real man also. Certainly the Shepherd's use of "cyeuckt [cooked]," "hyeuckt [hooked]," "nyeuck [nook]," "dyeuck [duck]," and "tyeuck [tough]"; of "yawtobeeograffy" and "owtobeaograffers"; of "eemetawtor," "yeckipage," "yippidemic," "leeshanses [licences]," "pairedowgs [paradox]," and "roaratoryawes [oratorios]" illustrates what he himself calls "my idiomatic accent." Not much is said in the *Noctes* on the subject *per se*. Hogg does consider "unobliterably" "a kittle word to pronounce." And his Scotch pronunciation of "monosyllable" once throws him off.

Shepherd. . . . But ae word explains a'—Genius—Genius—wull a' the metafizzians in the world ever expound that mysterious mony-syllable?

Tickler. Monysyllable, James, did ye say?

Shepherd. Ay—Monysyllable! Does na that mean a word o' three syllables?

Tickler. It's all one in the Greek—my dear James.

"Its Scotch is the best Scotch that has been written in modern times," declares Henry Lord Cockburn of the *Noctes* in 1856, and in the same year a writer in the *National Review* declares also, "In these *Noctes*, probably (but there is no certainty in such matters), we have the last extensive exhibition of the Scottish language in literature. . . ." Stevenson's *Thravn Janet* and J. M. Barrie's stories also—to mention only two names—prove otherwise, but at least the Ettrick Shepherd, and the *Noctes Ambrosianæ* in general for that matter, have gained the immortality of frequent quotation in the *New English Dictionary*. It must be added that the genuine Doric in the Shepherd's conversation has its embarrassments for an

¹ "The accusation [against Blackwood] is altogether a myth, or, to use one of the Shepherd's own expressions, 'a mere shimmera of the brain': Robert Carruthers, *Abbotsford Notanda*, a supplement to Robert Chambers' *Life of Sir Walter Scott* (1871), p. 147.

editor. In his edition of the *Noctes* R. Shelton Mackenzie, when Hogg speaks of "rowin' yoursell on the floor on your groof," explains *groof* in his note as "the sitting portion of the person."

B.—THE SHEPHERD AND JAMES HOGG

In 1855, the year after Wilson's death, his son-in-law and editor, Professor Ferrier, asserts in his introduction to the *Noctes Ambrosianæ* that "in wisdom the Shepherd equals the Socrates of Plato; in humour he surpasses the Falstaff of Shakespeare." Such superlative praise—by no means limited to Ferrier, for a Falstaffian Shepherd appears to have been the general contemporary conception—has value perhaps in giving us an understanding of Wilson's extraordinary appeal to his own age. But an earlier sentence in Ferrier's introduction has greater interest. "Out of very slender materials," he writes, Wilson bodied forth the Shepherd in the *Noctes*, "an ideal infinitely greater, and more real, and more original than the prototype from which it was drawn." A less biased writer of our own time has echoed this dictum more calmly: "The impersonation of Hogg, in particular, is a realistic triumph, and in that vivid portraiture the Ettrick Shepherd will live hardly less than in the records of his actual life and work." If the fictitious creation will live side by side with the James Hogg of Walter Scott's letters and of Lockhart's *Life of Scott*, how much, it may be asked in conclusion, has each in common with the other?

"Mr. Hogg," writes a contemporary in 1829, "is not exactly what he is made to appear in the *Noctes*. It is a powerful portrait, but a good deal exaggerated every way. The Shepherd seldom or never speaks poetical prose; or, if he does, it is by chance, not in a regular and intentional succession of sentences. In one thing the likeness is good,—the total want of all affectation, and the natural sincerity and simplicity of character, combined with a great deal of shrewd observation and strong common sense. . . . To a stranger, the Shepherd appears a dull inanimate man in conversation, but he is *not* so to those who know how to touch upon the right cords. . . ."

It needs no ghost come from the past to tell us that Hogg did not normally spout prose-poetry in his everyday talk, or, indeed, to inform us that the portrait in the *Noctes* "is a good deal exaggerated every way." But the rest of the passage has its value in asserting the general verisimilitude of Wilson's picture. What specific characteristics, also, did Wilson give?

1. Hogg's egotism

The disarming vanity of the real James Hogg might be illustrated again and again by excerpts from his four autobiographies and other writings or by the anecdotes of his friends and acquaintances. Wilson in the *Noctes*, it has been somewhat unkindly said, "retained just enough of the folly and vanity of Hogg to give piquancy and vitality to the glorious emanations of his genius." Certainly many an example of the Shepherd's egotism might be quoted from the series, but always, I think, combined with Wilson's humour. Thus the Shepherd once tells Tickler that he himself, like Burns, deserves to have a statue erected in his honour, just as in a later number he refers to "men o' genius like Me and Burns." Again, when Tickler in June, 1824, predicts that one hundred years hence Byron "will be ranked as the third name of our great era of the imaginative literature of England [*i.e.* next to Scott and Wordsworth]," Hogg innocently asks, "After Sir Walter and me?" In November, 1824, also, Hogg informs the company that Byron "was a tight-made, middle-sized man—no unlike mysel' in some things." He is equally ready to compare himself to Shakespeare and Milton. "The Queen's Wake," he contends, is "nearly about as perfect as ony work o' human genius; whereas Shakspeare's best plays, sic as Hamlet, Lear, and Othello, are but strang daubs." Again, "I hae mony a time thocht it took as muckle natural genius to make a jug of punch, as an epic poem, sic as Paradise Lost, or even Queen Hynde hersell!"

2. Hogg's coarseness

Thomas Pringle, editor of *Friendship's Offering*, tactfully wrote Hogg from London on the first of June, 1831:

Last year . . . the publishers and literary friend in whose hand I left the volume when I went to Scotland did not think your prose tale quite suitable for the book, it seems—its humour, they say, was *too broad*. . . .

Now, what I want from you this year is not a prose tale nor a long poem, but three or four short pieces, about a page or a couple of pages each, such as you have once or twice sent me. . . . And mind, take Mrs. Hogg's counsel as to the subjects and phraseology—for, without any disparagement to you, my friend, I opine she knows better than you what will suit a lady's work-table. . . .

Curiously the Shepherd's lapses in manners, sure to appeal to the sense of humour of the public in his day, appear surprisingly infrequently in the *Noctes*. In the very first number in which Hogg appears, that of December, 1822, Odoherty avers, to be sure, that a matter under discussion is "as devoid of point as the Ettrick Shepherd's own *gaucy* under-quarter, which, by the way, I wish he would give over scratching." Less than a year later, also, Hogg proudly remarks of his eating with a knife, "I never cut my mouth to any serious extent, above a score of times in my life." Two other similar examples, in addition, might be quoted. But at least twice, also, he speaks to North in satiric vein of coarseness: "Every thing nat'ral, and easy, and true, is ca'd coorse," and again, concerning his idea of writing a pastoral play different from Allan Ramsay's: "I wad hae mair variety o' characters, and incedents, and passions o' the human mind in my drama—mair fun, frolic, and daffin—in short, mair o' what you, and the like o' you, ca' coorseness."

3. Hogg's quick temper ; his placability

Into his fictitious creation Wilson carried the childlike simplicity and constitutional irritability of the real James Hogg, along with his masculinity and good temper and his sympathy for others.

If the Shepherd is always ready to quarrel, he is always ready, also, to shake hands and make up. Detected in a lie, he vehemently shouts at North in October, 1828:

Let me tell you to the face o' you, that you're a damned arrogant, upsettin', impudent fallow, and that I do not care the crack o' my thoom for you, or your Magazin, or your Buchanan Lodge, were you and they worth ten thousand million times mair than what you ever will be, as lang's your name's Christopher North.

But his next speech runs: "... As we've been baith to blame, especially you, who began it a' by shammin' sleep, let's shake hauns—and say nae mair about it." After Hogg's real quarrel with William Blackwood and incidentally with Wilson in 1832, the affecting return of the Shepherd in May, 1834, bursting with forgiveness and vitality, makes one of the pleasantest scenes in the *Noctes*. Constantly also he shows solicitude for his fellow-characters. When North, for instance, has a twinge of the gout, the Shepherd appears beside himself with sympathy: "Oh, sir! oh, sir! say that the pain's milder noo, sir. . . ."

4. Hogg's "inexhaustible content"

In his later years, according to Carruthers, "Hogg retained a careless brightness of conversation and joyous manner which were seen in no other man." In his own *Reminiscences of Former Days* added to the *Autobiography* of 1832, Hogg himself writes :

One may think, in reading over this Memoir, that I must have worn out a life of misery and wretchedness ; but the case has been quite the reverse. I never knew either man or woman who has been so uniformly happy as I have been ; which has been partly owing to a good constitution, and partly from the conviction that a heavenly gift, conferring the powers of immortal song, was inherent in my soul. . . .

Compare Wilson's tribute put into the Shepherd's mouth in the sixty-seventh *Noctes* of August, 1834 :

. . . O' this world's gear I hae but little—but I hae a mine o' contentment within my ain breast, that's mair productive than a' the mines o' Potosi and Peru. There hae been times when I had to draw deep on the materials there, but I rejoiced to find that they were inexhaustible.

* * * * *

"I shall dine late ; but the dining-room will be well lighted, the guests few and select," a master of dialogue has written in a famous passage. At Wilson's table, lighted fitfully by the Roman candles of his wit, feasted the multitude during his lifetime only. But if Wilson's writing lacks Landor's passion recollected in tranquillity, and if his style lacks Landor's hard, gemlike flame ; if posterity approves, rightly, the depth and not the tumult of the soul, yet it is almost a pity. For the fare of the *Noctes Ambrosianæ* is Gargantuan, and the Shepherd is there in person, not a boozing buffoon in cap and bells merely, but a fitting representative of Bacchus and Apollo, friendly, and hospitable, and rollicking, and easily satisfied : " It's sometimes no unpleasant to listen to discussion ane but verra imperfectly understaun's—especially owre sic tipples."

FROM MANUSCRIPT TO PRINT

BY W. W. GREG

I THINK one may say, without much fear of contradiction, that the central problem of critical bibliography, so far as the products of the press are concerned, lies in the relation of the printed book to its copy ; or, to look at it from a slightly different angle, in determining what supervision a literary work received in its passage from manuscript to print, on the one hand by the author, on the other by the technical correctors of the press. Certainly no one will doubt the value of reliable information on this question who is aware of the curious misapprehensions that have existed in the past and the critical errors to which they have led.

It must, therefore, have been with lively anticipation that all those concerned with textual criticism in its widest sense turned to the stately first-comer of the Oxford Books on Bibliography—a series generously planned and finely executed—which is devoted to this very subject.¹ Nor will they have been disappointed, for Mr. Simpson and the coadjutors whose help he records are to be sincerely congratulated on the wealth of the material they have collected. It is true that some of this has already been published in scattered articles—the most important by Mr. Simpson himself—and perhaps not all the views expressed are quite as new or quite as certain as the author seems to believe, but to have practically everything relevant to the problem gathered together, discussed, and illustrated within the compass of a single volume is a blessing for which every true bibliographer will be grateful.

It is with a deep sense of the obligation I am under that I propose to pass in review some of the matters touched on by Mr. Simpson, in the hope that here and there I may be able to take the discussion one step further, or with the object occasionally of

¹ *Proof-Reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries.* By Percy Simpson. London : Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford. 1935. Pp. xii + 251. 11 × 7½ inches. 45s. net.

putting another view, when I have the misfortune to disagree with the one here taken.

There was a superstition long prevalent among editors to the effect that Elizabethan authors had no opportunity of correcting their works in proof. Of this Mr. Simpson has little difficulty in disposing, for many allusions to proof-reading are to be found in the writings of the time, while, as he is able to show, a number of specimens of corrected proof-sheets actually survive. Curiously enough, however, the bulk of the first chapter of his book, important as it is in its own way, and though it is apparently put forward as a parallel proof of the author's thesis, might easily be mistaken by the unwary for an argument on the opposite side. It does, indeed, support the view that authors were properly solicitous of the accuracy with which their works were given to the world, but it also most abundantly proves, if not that they were unprovided with proofs, at least that the care they bestowed on them was often lamentably inadequate.

"A test case", says Mr. Simpson, is *A Dialogue of Sir Thomas More*, 1529, some copies of which have a list of 254 errata, affording evidence of "scrupulous proof-reading" (p. 3). But surely it is evidence of precisely the opposite: namely that the revision that should have been done in proof was actually neglected till after the sheets had been printed off.¹ It is the same with the second edition of the *Dialogue*, which appeared the following year with a list of 91 errata. "In this example 'newly overseen' is most naturally explained as a reading of the proofs by the author, who corrected sheet D when he added the list of errata" (p. 4). The errata are on D4 and "it is noteworthy", according to Mr. Simpson, that no errata are given for sheet D. But this is only what we should expect, since it is obvious that no errata could be added to the list after D had been printed off, while any error in D discovered before printing could be corrected in the text and would therefore require no erratum. The list tells us just nothing as to More's reading of the proofs—at any rate of the earlier sheets—except that it was at the best very imperfect. On the other hand, the fact that, as

¹ One of the errors, we are told, "was discovered after the list of errata had been printed, and is appended as a sort of footnote" (p. 4). Does Mr. Simpson really mean that the sheet was passed through the press a second time in order to add the note or that this was subsequently stamped in by hand? Is it not the fact that all the note proves is that the error was discovered after the main list had been compiled, and was perhaps in proof, and that it was added at the end rather than upset the arrangement?

Mr. Simpson informs us, some of the 1529 errata remained uncorrected in the 1530 text and do not reappear in the 1530 errata does not speak highly for the diligence of either author or printer.

The *locus classicus* respecting proof-reading is the quarrel between Brooke and Jaggard over the York Herald's *Catalogue and Succession*. This work, which was printed by Jaggard, was violently attacked by Vincent in his *Discovery of Errors*, which also came from Jaggard's press. Hearing of the onslaught in preparation, Brooke rushed out a new and corrected edition of his work (printed for him by Stansby) in the preface to which he threw the blame for the errors on the printer. Jaggard, incensed at the unfairness of the attack, retorted in a preface to his friend Vincent's work. "He complains that Brooke, in his hurry to get the new edition out, made the printers work day and night; that proofs and revises . . . were sent to the author, who returned them corrected; and finally that the original manuscript had been preserved, from which it could be proved that the errors were the author's, and not the printer's" (pp. 6-7). Mr. Simpson has surely fallen into some confusion here. That Brooke was in a hurry over the *new* edition is true, but that he drove Stansby's compositors hard was no concern of Jaggard's: the latter's object was to defend his printing of the *first* edition, and it is to the copy, proofs, and revises of this that his remarks must be taken to refer.

Mr. Simpson has collected many illuminating comments that accompany errata lists. These do sometimes afford valuable evidence for the practice of proof-reading, in that the authors explain that errata are needed because for some reason they were prevented from attending to the proofs. This is so in the case of Gascoigne's *Drum of Doomsday* and Young's translation of Montemayor, and their remarks should have given warning as to the real implication of errata. Actually Mr. Simpson writes: "Gascoigne and Young did some belated proof-reading after their books had been printed off" (p. 9)—which seems a contradiction in terms. I should like to add to Mr. Simpson's collection one example which, though perhaps irrelevant, is not unhappy. In the Latin play of *Pedantius*, printed in 1631 at the sign of the Greyhound, the author headed a list of errors with the words, "*Festinans Canis (Leporarius) hos cæcos peperit Catulos*"—the Greyhound in her haste dropped this litter of blind pups!

Mr. Simpson next introduces us to variations between different

copies of the same edition, that is to say alterations made in the type in the course of pulling the sheets, and to the problems they raise. It is hardly possible to explain the peculiarity (as Mr. Simpson seems inclined to do on p. 19) on the supposition that proof-pulls—of which we happen to know that a rather large number were taken in the seventeenth century—got accidentally mixed up with the finally corrected sheets; for it sometimes happens that it is the uncorrected state of a forme that is found in the majority of copies, the corrected state appearing in a few only.¹ Now, of all writers, Jonson may be supposed to have read his proofs with care, and to have insisted on the printer waiting till he had received the corrections: yet correction in the course of printing is frequent in Jonson's works. I do not know whether Mr. Simpson has considered that the solution of this paradox may lie in the distinction between proofs and revises or "reviews." I would suggest that Jonson may have duly corrected his proofs, and the printer duly awaited their return, and that revises were then dispatched as an assurance that the corrections had been properly made. But the printer would hardly tolerate further delay, if these were not promptly returned. Ben, however, whose proof-reading seems to have been more fussy than accurate, probably started to read the revises through again, and made a fresh batch of alterations that only reached the printing-house after part of the impression had already been pulled.² Be this as it may, it is clear that correction in the course of printing is evidence, not that the sheets had been read in proof, but that if they were the reading had been either inadequate or dilatory.

The practice of correcting sheets in the course of printing was, of course, extremely common, and it raises many and complex problems for the bibliographer and the textual critic. It was not to be expected that Mr. Simpson should enter into a detailed discussion of the subject, welcome as a full and critical treatment would be, but I confess that he seems to me to dismiss it rather perfunctorily, and as though he failed to appreciate its importance. It is really far more relevant to the question of proof-reading than are either errata lists or cancels.

It is to cancels that we come next. These, of course, fulfilled the same function as errata lists, and afforded an alternative method

¹ In quire G of the Jonson folio of 1616 what appears to be the corrected state is quite rare.

² Some pages of the Jonson folio are found in three if not four stages of correction.

of correcting errors discovered after the whole number of pulls had been made of the sheet in question. The normal method was to reprint the leaf, or it might be the several leaves, involved; but it alternatively an error might be corrected by pasting a small slip of paper bearing the correction over the peccant passage, or in the case of an omission, in the margin. Sometimes only quite small slips were used. Mr. Simpson instances the well-known corrections thus effected in the attribution of poems in *England's Helicon*, on which he makes the curious comment that "No copy without the cancel-slips is recorded, and they may have been put in before publication" (p. 22). Obviously they were put in before publication: I suppose that what Mr. Simpson had in mind was that they were put into all copies before publication began. There are also several such slips in Hughes' *Misfortunes of Arthur*, 1587, one in Gascoigne's *Glass of Government*, 1575, and one in the first edition of *Mucedorus*, 1598; while Mr. Simpson himself later draws attention to that in Harington's *Orlando*, 1591 (p. 75).

Sometimes, where an addition had to be made, instead of the missing words being supplied on a separate slip, they were stamped in, perhaps by hand, on the sheet itself. Thus, for example, the 1599 edition of *Soliman and Perseda* originally bore no indication that it was a reprint; but later on, after the majority of copies apparently had been sold, the words "Newly corrected and amended" were added to the title-page. I suppose that this is what happened in some copies of Bartholomaeus' *Summa*, 1475, though Mr. Simpson's remark that Zainer "decided to print the missing words on the page" (p. 19) is rather ambiguous. It certainly happened in the case of Lyly's *Sappho and Phao*, 1591—actually the third, not the second, edition—of which Mr. Simpson gives a somewhat misleading account. "Discovering that the page [C4^v] was short, Orwin seems to have decided to take over [*i.e.* bring back] the first line of D[1^r], cancelled it there, but forgot to insert it on the preceding page. So [after the sheet had been printed] he pasted a white slip over the catchword [on C4^v], left a line of 'white', and printed the missing line below . . . Why the lost line was not printed higher, only Thomas Orwin knows" (pp. 20-1). Now, in the first place C4^v was not a line short, it has the full normal complement, and that the missing line originally stood at the head of D1^r is an inference for which there appears to be no ground whatever. Further the statement that the printer

"left a line of 'white'," is meaningless, since the original page and the addition were never in the chase together. All that happened was that the missing line was stamped in rather too low in the copy Mr. Simpson happened to examine. How the line came to be lost is a question to which I will return in a moment. At least Mr. Simpson has recognized the fact that it must have been set up with the rest and that its loss was due to a subsequent accident.

Had he borne this in mind it would have saved him from an unfortunate suggestion in connection with the *Book of Martyrs*. The case itself is a very interesting one. As printed, the second column of p. 772 of the edition of 1563 ends with the catchword "was", while the first of the next page begins with the second half of the word "[sacri-]fice". The gap in the text is bridged by a slip pasted on at the foot of p. 772 containing exactly two lines of text, each of which begins with the words "was sent to be our". Mr. Simpson calls it "an instructive example of an omission due to repeated words" (p. 20), but it is very difficult to see how this can have been the cause. Obviously, since exactly two lines of *prose* were omitted, and the text continues in the middle of a word, the loss did not occur in composition but after the lines had been set up; nor could the fact that the lines began alike be a reason for omitting *both*. The cause must have been purely accidental. Nor is it difficult to imagine what happened both here and in Lyly's play. The compositor, when near the end of the page (or column), set up in his stick more lines than were necessary to complete it. These he transferred to the galley, and he then proceeded to make up the pages (or columns) to the required length.¹ The superfluous lines should have been put back into the stick: instead they were left standing loose and were mislaid. When he began setting again, the compositor naturally went on from the point at which he had stopped, and which he had no doubt marked in his copy, so that the matter he had already set, but excluded from the previous page, simply disappeared from the text. That in one case the lines began with the same words seems to have been a mere coincidence.

Another interesting method of correction, on which Mr. Simpson has collected valuable evidence, is that of making alterations in pen and ink. Two types should be clearly distinguished: copies specially corrected, usually with a view to presentation; and books

¹ In fact he crowded one more line into the column of the *Book of Martyrs* than it could properly take.

in which all (or at least many) copies were corrected before publication. In the former case it is, of course, natural that the corrections should usually be in the author's own hand; but the curious thing is that in the latter case, too, several instances are known in which the corrections are autograph. Thus Bale's own alterations in his edition of Leyland's *Laborious Journey* are found in two copies at the British Museum and five at the Bodleian. It is Mr. Simpson who supplies these statistics, and it is a little confusing when on the next page he writes of "Massinger's autograph corrections in seven copies of his printed text" (p. 26), for they occur not in several copies of one play but in single copies of several different plays. Massinger's corrections belong to the first type, Bale's to the second.

To Mr. Simpson's examples may be added the plays of Sir William Lower printed at The Hague, 1658-60, all three of which, I think, contain corrections by the author. The same method was, of course, also sometimes used to correct misleading signatures, as, for instance, in the fourth folio Shakespeare.

In his account of the difficulties that printers might experience with illegible and confused copy, I cannot help thinking that Mr. Simpson has misinterpreted Speed's remarks, in his correspondence with Sir Robert Cotton, when he says: "Speed sent a revise to Cotton at Connington . . . He asks for the revise to be returned promptly, 'for the printer already hath overtaken vs'" (p. 34). I can find no mention of any "revise" in the letters in Julius C. III: Speed speaks only of "copy" and "sheets", and I have no doubt that it was part of his own manuscript, already in the printer's hands, that he recovered and sent to Cotton for correction. Even had he used the word "review"—the regular term for what we now call a "revise"—it would not necessarily have meant a printed sheet, as appears from Dryden's letter to Tonson, which Mr. Simpson quotes on p. 41, where "the last review" evidently means the final revision of the copy before it was set up.

Here and there in his first chapter there are expressions which I could wish Mr. Simpson had reconsidered or made more exact. Thus on p. 19 we find the caution that "it is clearly the duty of an editor . . . to collate a sufficient number of copies to ensure that he reproduces not only what the author had in his manuscript or corrected while the book was in the press, but what the printer actually succeeded in printing." If I follow this correctly it seems

to me to be false: at least I should have put it the other way round!¹

In his second chapter Mr. Simpson passes from recorded and inferential evidence as to the manner in which authors dealt with their copy and proofs, to the actual material evidence that survives, in the shape of copy that has passed through the printer's hands and proofs that have been corrected for the press, whether in the printing house or by the author himself. The magnificent array of documents here collected will probably surprise all who have hitherto given attention to the subject, and Mr. Simpson elucidates them out of the stores of his own experience. They are discussed for the most part in chronological order. I cannot help feeling that it would have helped to make the exposition clearer and more logical if copy and proofs had been treated separately. It is true that in a few remarkable instances both survive, but the bibliographical significance of the two is very different, and it is desirable that the distinction should be made clear. It may, indeed, seem obvious; yet on p. 49, Mr. Simpson, arguing that "proof-reading by authors was a common practice", remarks, "the conclusive test is the number of early proof-sheets and examples of authors' copy which have survived". That proof-sheets imply proof-reading is clear—though only by the author if the corrections are autograph—but surely author's copy proves nothing of the sort. There seems to be some further confusion in the statement (on the same page) that "proofs would not leave the printing-house until they were sent out for the author's or the editor's corrections, and they would presumably be returned with the revise." How a revise could be made until the corrected proofs had been returned it is difficult to imagine: perhaps Mr. Simpson intended to write "returned with his revision."²

¹ He also speaks of two leaves of errata in Aepinus' *Liber de Purgatorio* as printed "in an italicized gothic script" (p. 8). Without arguing whether "script" is a proper term to apply to type, or whether "italicized" would not better be "sloped"—it is in fact the most astonishing early type I have ever seen!—I may point out that only the heading and conclusion of the list are so printed, the body being in a perfectly ordinary bastard letter. Again, we are told that in Urquhart's *Epigrams*, 1641, "a leaf is added after p. 60, which concludes with a list of errata" (p. 17). Passing over the slight ambiguity here ("which" actually refers to the page and not the leaf) it should be observed that the leaf is in no sense "added", being in fact 13, an integral part of the quire.

² Dr. McKerrow has suggested to me that Mr. Simpson may possibly mean that proofs were sent out to the author and returned with his corrections; that the printer then corrected the type, pulled a revise, and sent this together with the original proof back to the author; and that finally the author returned both proof and revise to the printer. This is sometimes the modern practice (at least

In his interesting discussion on the rate of printing I feel that Mr. Simpson, like many other writers, is a little hazy as to the bearing of the number of presses upon the manner in which a book was printed. He writes: "When a printer with at most two presses had a book on the stocks, he could do nothing else till he had printed it off" (p. 46). Is not this a rather thoughtless remark? Since most printers had only one press, it is obvious that a man with two presses could, if he chose, print two books simultaneously: and even a man with only one press could always hold up the composition and printing of one work while he took in hand another. It was mainly the shortage of type that made it necessary for a printer to go ahead without waiting for tardy proofs, unless he was to keep men and machines idle.

Mr. Simpson discusses at length the curious method of marking copy in the early printing houses, a method that seems to have been traditional all over Europe. But it is rather misleading to describe the marking off as "invariably done by the pages within the signatures, not by the pages of the printed book" (p. 49). For what are "the pages within the signatures" if not "pages of the printed book"? What Mr. Simpson appears to mean is "not by the continuous pagination of the book." But in fact the continuous pagination (if there is one) often *is* added to the marking. The really curious point, as Mr. Simpson recognizes elsewhere, is that numbering was done by pages, and not leaves, within the signatures, so that the marking disagrees with the printed signatures, the page bearing the signature A4, for instance, being marked as A7.

Mr. Simpson is clearly right in supposing that the marking off was done by the compositor. But he seems rather to have misinterpreted Moxon and Johnson, for he represents each as saying that "as soon as a page is set up" the corrector reads it (pp. 50-1), though it is clear from the quotations that what these authorities envisage is not a page but a sheet. Thus Moxon says that the corrector should see that "the *Form* be right *Impos'd*", while Johnson directs him to mark the "*prima* of the ensuing sheet". These words cannot apply to less than a forme. The contradiction is perhaps only due to careless expression, as in the remark, "a prose work, where the lines run across the page" (p. 52)—as if verse were printed Chinese-fashion!

in America) but I do not for a moment suppose that sixteenth or sixteenth century printers and authors were so meticulous!

Scorning the days "when sciolists cheerfully assumed . . . that the printer invariably made a filthy mess of copy and burnt it when he had done with it" (pp. 56-7), Mr. Simpson rightly draws attention to the remarkably clean state of most of the printer's copy that has come down to us. But he is unfortunate in his illustration when he proceeds: "Consider the famous manuscript in private hands from which Caxton printed his second edition of *The Canterbury Tales* in 1484. . . . Can any one suppose that he did not return the manuscript in an immaculate condition?" (p. 57). There was, indeed, no reason why he should not, for it was never in the compositor's hands: Caxton only used it to correct his first edition by. The instance is not only imaginary but irrelevant.

Passing to examples actually extant, we note that "The earliest fully authenticated specimen of copy in England is a manuscript of John Lydgate's *Siege of Thebes* now in the library of St. John's College, Oxford" (p. 57), from which de Worde printed the *editio princeps* about 1500. But is this really better authenticated than the manuscript of *The Assembly of the Gods* at Trinity College, Cambridge, which de Worde had used some two years before, and concerning which Mr. Simpson himself assures us that "the evidence is complete" (p. 59)?¹ However, Mr. Simpson admirably brings out the interest of this Trinity manuscript, which was used as copy not only by de Worde, about 1498, but again for some of the additions in Stow's *Chaucer* of 1561.

Another very interesting example is the manuscript of the *Confessio Amantis* at Magdalen College, Oxford, with its sporadic printer's markings. These, where they occur, correspond to the pages of Caxton's *editio princeps* of 1483, and they certainly establish some connection between the two. "The evidence is incomplete," says Mr. Simpson, "but it cannot be lightly dismissed in view of the fact that these are certainly printer's marks and that their intermittent use can be accounted for by Caxton's collation of a second manu-

¹ I assume that by the "date" of copy not specially written for the book printed from it, we are to understand the date at which it was used as copy, not that at which it was written; for this trifling ambiguity does not appear to have occurred to Mr. Simpson. In any case it was surely a little careless to write: "The manuscript has been fully described . . . it contains Caxton's edition of *Troilus and Criseyde*, . . ." (p. 57), and scarcely less: "In the frontispiece we give a facsimile of folio 28 verso of the manuscript, corresponding to fi and fi verso of Wynkyn de Worde's text" (p. 58), seeing that it does not "correspond", but contains only the text of fi recto, with portions of the preceding and following pages.

script" (p. 61). I find it difficult to imagine how the *collation* of another manuscript can account for the peculiarity. A possible explanation would be the use of a second manuscript as copy for parts of the work, but this should be determinable by a study of the text. Does the printed edition show a closer agreement with the manuscript in the marked portion than elsewhere? If not, some other explanation must be sought—perhaps no more recondite than carelessness on the part of a compositor.

A curious case is that of a fragment of Caxton's edition of *Troilus and Criseyde*, about 1482, now in the British Museum, and used, it is here assumed, as copy for an unidentified edition of Chaucer in the sixteenth century. Some passages in the fragment have been deleted, and with admirable detective instinct Mr. Simpson shows that "the text thus doctored corresponds exactly to three leaves of Thynne's collected edition of 1532" (p. 62). This he considers "decisive evidence" that the leaves were intended to fill a lacuna in a volume of Thynne for use by a printer as copy. The first part of the inference is reasonable enough, but I fail to see why Mr. Simpson supposes that the gap was made good in preparation for a reprint. The making up of defective copies with leaves from other editions was not infrequent: I possess a copy of the 1627-8 *Arcadia* in which a lacuna has been supplied by leaves from that of 1593, and the duplication of text involved has been duly indicated.

Mr. Simpson's account of the puzzling case of Stow's *Summary of English Chronicles*, 1565, opens with the rather cryptic remark that "The history of the [Douce] manuscript can be fully traced, though the exact form in which it was printed is not quite certain" (p. 66). Since manuscript and print are both extant, I conclude that it is the relation between the two rather than the "form" of either that is in doubt; but the obscurity may not be due to Mr. Simpson, for at this point something appears to have gone wrong with the usually impeccable typography of the volume. Certainly Stow's text as printed is expanded from that of the manuscript, and a curious anecdote about William Rufus is altered from prose to verse. Mr. Simpson duly records that a marginal note attributes the lines to "One Robert": it would perhaps have been kinder to mention that they come from the Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester (ed. Hearne, 1724, p. 390). A footnote reads (p. 68): "It should be noted that Lowndes in his *Bibliographer's Manual* records that a first edition of Stow's [book] was published in 1561. 'The

only copy known is in the Grenville Collection,' and the 'title-page is wanting'. The Collection is now in the British Museum and does not contain this unique copy. Lowndes is probably in error." It happens that Lowndes took his information quite correctly from the Grenville catalogue, which in turn copied it from Grenville's own notes in an imperfect copy in the collection, which is now identified in the General Catalogue as belonging to the edition of 1607.

An instance in which both copy and proof survive is Miles Windsor's table of the Universities of Europe, "a two-sheet broad-side" consisting of two full sheets printed on one side only and intended to be pasted together at the edge. I am a little puzzled by Mr. Simpson's statement respecting the lower sheet of the 1592 edition, that "the margins bear the impression of the chase" (p. 76). The chase should be considerably below the level of the type-face, and it is not easy to see how it could impress the paper. Are not the marks rather caused by packing masked by the frisket? Blind impressions of ornaments and the like are sometimes found in Elizabethan books. I should like to call attention to one interesting detail. The very first word of the text is misprinted "BRVTANNIÆ" and a glance at the copy shows how easy it was for the compositor to misread Windsor's "y" as "v". The error was not corrected in the proof.

I will now retrace my steps and consider a few of the instances in which it is not the copy but the proof that Mr. Simpson's diligence has recovered for our instruction. "The earliest scrap of proof of an English book", we are told (p. 57), is a fragment of de Worde's *Little John*, 1492. It is adjudged to be proof because it is printed on one side of the paper only: it shows no corrections. But this is no certain criterion, as Mr. Simpson himself points out in another connexion (p. 65, note).

The very interesting find at Queen's College, Oxford, in 1932 included a bundle of sheets of the 1527 *Polychronicon*. "The sheets are aa 1, the title-leaf, and ten copies of aa 8 verso, a leaf of the table. The ten sheets have a trial title-page" (p. 65). This is neither clear nor accurate. Mr. Gibson, who originally announced the discovery in *The Library*, has kindly informed me of the facts. There are in all eleven copies of the sheet aa1.8, of which 1 recto bears the title-page, 1 verso a set of verses, and 8 recto and verso pages of the table. One of the sheets bears the title-page in its final form, ten bear it in the trial state.

Another item in the same find was a corrected proof of a sheet (N2.5) of *The Great Herbal* of 1526. The corrections are instructive, but Mr. Simpson's account of them contains one or two slips. Marks between words are caused by "spaces" not "leads", and "greueth" should be "greweth" (p. 64). Mr. Gibson gave these points correctly in *The Library*. But I cannot help feeling sceptical about another correction on which our two authorities agree, namely that in the word "fyrst" one form of the black-letter "r" was substituted for the other. The deleted letter of the proof is illegible in the admirable facsimile: is it really certain in the original? I cannot conceive a press reader making such an alteration. It may be added, as a point of interest, that there would seem to have been a revise of this forme, since three errors overlooked in the proof are found corrected in the printed sheet.

It is noteworthy that though this proof is printed on both sides, the corrections are confined to one forme (the inner). The same peculiarity is to be observed in a proof of a sheet (B) of *The First Part of the Contention*, 1600, in the Huntington Library (in which it is the outer forme that shows the corrections).¹ This is at first sight puzzling, and Mr. Simpson does not suggest any explanation. Why should one forme show proof corrections, while the other agrees with the finished sheet? That all the compositor's errors happened to be concentrated in one forme would be a coincidence that we should hardly be justified in assuming. The reader might, of course, have carelessly overlooked one forme; but that the few remaining proof-sheets should afford two instances of such an oversight is not to be believed. Evidently the type of one forme had already been corrected. What we must suppose is that one forme was first put on the press and a proof pulled. This was read immediately (there is no reason to suppose that, in the two instance in question, the corrections were made outside the printing houses), the forme at once corrected, and the sheet printed (on one side). Then the other forme was put on the press and a proof taken, not on a blank sheet, but by perfecting one of the sheets already printed (probably a waste). There is, of course, the difficulty that it is normally the inner forme that is ready first, whereas in the case of the *Herbal* we have to suppose that the outer was first printed. But there seems

¹ Mr. Simpson is in error in saying (p. 80) that there is a correction on B3 verso: this contradicts his earlier statement, and the reading in question is actually found on B3 recto.

to have been no fixed rule in the Elizabethan printing office, and unless the fount was short or the press waiting, it may well have been a matter of chance which forme was given precedence.

None of these relics present problems more intriguing to the bibliographer than the solitary remains of what Mr. Simpson describes as the "suppressed" Marprelate tract of *Plain Piers*. Whether the epithet quite happily describes a work that was apparently abandoned after a few pages had been set, may perhaps be questioned. One peculiarity of the book is that it is a quarto in half-sheets, each signature consisting of two leaves (four pages) only. I think that Mr. Simpson is right in supposing (p. 70) that this cannot have been due to lack of type, for though we cannot be certain (as he assumes) that twelve pages were set up at once, it seems on the whole likely. He suggests in explanation, either the use of a small portable press, only capable of printing two quarto pages at a time, or else the inconvenience of carrying about a stock of full-size sheets. "On the whole, the last explanation seems the likelier" to Mr. Simpson (p. 71), though why, I am at a loss to imagine. Surely, since the weight is not affected, parcels measuring 16×12 inches would hardly be more formidable than others half the size, if you were already carting a whole printing press about with you. A small travelling press seems the natural explanation.

But the interest of the fragment, which was acquired by the British Museum in 1932, does not end here. The remains consist of the four signatures A to D. A is printed on both sides, and is presumably a finished sheet, B to D are proofs, printed on one side only: there are reader's corrections in B and C, but not in D. All are folded into book-form. Mr. Simpson finds it "odd" that thus folded "the blank pages face one another" (p. 69). On the contrary it would be exceedingly odd if they did not, for this is the natural arrangement. What is remarkable, as contravening all typographical rules, is that while C and D are quite normal, in B the recto pages appear on the versos and the verso pages on the rectos. One can only suppose that the type-pages had been put into the chase by the printer's devil! Two illustrations of this fragment are given, a block of the title-page and a colotype of one of the pages corrected by the reader (B2'). It would have been interesting to have a reproduction of A2 recto, for this shows a factotum block, similar to one used by Allde and others, which has not hitherto been traced in work by the Martinist

press. Indeed, one would like to know more about this tract from several points of view.

By a curious chance two independent groups of proof fragments survive of Cartwright's *Royal Slave*, 1639, one in the Bodleian, the other lately in the Thorn-Drury collection. The former, according to Mr. Simpson, consists of A1-2 and I1-2, from which one might be tempted to infer that these were half-sheets printed together. In fact A is a whole sheet, and Mr. Simpson should have mentioned that at least a part of A3 remains in the Bodleian fragment. Signature I is a half-sheet, and Mr. Simpson might also have mentioned (what I believe to be the fact) that the four pages were imposed in one chase, showing that the method known as half-sheet imposition was practised. I wonder how Mr. Simpson knows that the corrections in the Bodleian fragments are in Cartwright's own handwriting, as he implies (p. 84). He notes that it is only in the minor corrections that the Thorn-Drury fragment shows the same hand as the Bodleian, the one textual correction being in a different hand. From which the natural inference is that the Bodleian corrections are not autograph.¹

This question of the handwriting in which corrections are made is of more than academic interest. Indeed, it might have been a help if Mr. Simpson had throughout emphasized the distinction between those proofs which appear to have been merely

¹ A few miscellaneous notes on Chapter II may be added.

P. 52. The date of *John a Kent* is given as probably 1594, while a footnote records Mr. Pollard's suggestion of 1593 for the date of *Sir Thomas More*. These are inconsistent: the former manuscript is almost certainly by some years the older.

P. 56. Copland's dialogue with Quidam is described as "a flight of humour by a printer who was careful about spelling and punctuation"; but the text hardly bears out the description.

P. 73. A note "So in the MS." is added where Harington writes "the xxijth booke", quite correctly, for "three and twentieth". This is a hoary trap!

P. 82. I do not think that Mr. Simpson is justified in assuming that, for plays first printed in the folio, "Published according to the True Originall Copies" means "from Shakespeare's autograph."

P. 83. I do not understand the statement that fragments of the 1624 *Anatomy of Melancholy* at Christ Church "are about two-thirds of page 80 . . . printed in galley". Do they not correspond to the page of the printed book? If they are really galley-proofs they are of quite exceptional importance: also if the corrections are indeed Burton's.

P. 87. The account of the "Bloudy Twins" in Foulis's *History of our Pretended Saints* is rendered unintelligible by the use of "chapter-heading" where "head-title" is meant.

P. 101, l. 24. "But he had also to cancel the second 'No'" makes no sense that I can see. Presumably what the compositor cancelled was the bracket he had placed before the second "No".

corrected by a printer's reader and those which afford evidence of more authoritative revision, since it would be uncritical to cite the former in witness that proofs were ever submitted to the author. Unfortunately autograph proof-corrections are exceedingly rare: the present exhaustive collection appears to contain no certain examples of any importance.

Mr. Simpson completes his survey with a chapter on "Correctors of the Press."¹ Like the rest, this is of the greatest importance to the bibliographical critic, for the very necessary individual whose activities are here considered developed quite illegitimately quasi-editorial functions. That he did so was the inevitable result of the laziness of authors and their inability to master the technic of their profession. For the plain fact is that an author who throws the blame for the shortcomings of his work upon the printer—and Mr. Simpson fills pages with instances of such attempts—is merely advertising his own incompetence.

Mr. Simpson's handsome volume will long remain indispensable, not only to professed students of bibliography, but to all whose critical paths lead them to wander in the textual fields of our earlier literature. The amount of important information that he has garnered is enormous, and no less the diligence with which it has been sifted. For the most part he is a pioneer, discussing documents for the first time, and it is hardly surprising if he has occasionally got embrangled in the wealth of his material.

¹ That on "The Oxford Press and its Correctors" and an appendix on the fees paid to them are of more restricted interest.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

CHAUCEER'S USE OF *DISCREET*

THE use of *discreet* in the sense of "well-spoken, civil, polite, courteous" is recorded in the *New English Dictionary* and the *English Dialect Dictionary* as a peculiarly Scotch idiom, and no earlier example of it is cited than this one from Thomson's *Seasons* :

Dear youth ! sole judge of what these verses mean,
By fortune too much favoured, but by love,
Alas ! not favoured less, be still as now
Discreet.

(*Summer*, 1367-70.)

In his Dictionary Dr. Johnson had used these very lines to illustrate the meaning "modest," which, however, he considered "not well authenticated."¹ And if we were to judge by early dictionary definitions of the word, we should be obliged to grant that till the seventeenth century at least pleasantness of disposition as a connotation of the word had not, as far as the evidence shows, succeeded in establishing itself alongside of the primary one, namely discernment or shrewdness in judging. But do we not as early as in Chaucer's writings find traces of a development of meaning in this direction ? That the new meaning—assuming for the moment that it did begin to develop so early—did not succeed, in spite of Chaucer's example and influence, in establishing itself in standard English is of little significance ; it has been the fate of not a few Middle English locutions, Chaucerianisms among them, to survive merely as dialectal peculiarities.

In Chaucer's writings the words *discreet*, *discreetly*, and *discretion* occur no fewer than fifty times,² and at first blush it certainly appears that in every instance they have been used exactly as we might use them to-day in standard English. And if the entire absence of special comment or gloss is any indication, it would appear

¹ In his *Governour* (I. xxv) Sir Thomas Elyot had indeed identified discretion with modesty, but by modesty he meant moderation.

² In Tatlock's *Concordance*, *discreet* is listed 18 times, *discreetly* 6 times, and *discretion* 26 times.

too that in not a single instance has a Chaucerian editor or commentator thought it necessary to revise his first impression. But I believe that there are a couple of contexts in which the word *discreet* is meant to imply as much behaviour towards others as personal prudence or wisdom.

No doubt the matter calls for very wary handling. Take, for instance, the use of the word in the following lines characterizing Griselda in the *Clerkes Tale* :

For thogh that ever vertuous was she,
She was encreased in swich excellence
Of thewes gode, y-set in heigh bountee,
And so discreet and fair of eloquence,
So benigne and so digne of reverence,
And coude so the peples herte embrace,
That ech hir lovede that looked on hir face.

(*The Canterbury Tales*—E 407-13.)

It would not do to argue here that the entire description concentrates on Griselda's amiability and moral worth and that the *discreet* in the fourth line must, therefore, be regarded as pointing to a social rather than a mental quality and suggesting courtesy rather than wisdom. For the very line in which *discreet* occurs does, however incongruously, dwell on a mental trait. For Chaucer's phrase "discreet and fair of eloquence" translates Petrarch's "*ea uerborum grauitas ac dulcedo.*"¹

However, there is perhaps less justification for the word in its normal sense in this later reference to Griselda :

in her grete estaet

Hir goost was ever in pleyen humylitee ;
No tendre mouth, non herte delicate,
No pompe, no semblant of royaltee,
But ful of pacient beniguitee,
Discreet and prydeles, ay honourable,
And to hir housbonde ever meke and stable.
(Ibid., 925-31.)

(*Ibid.*, 925-31.)

The corresponding passage in Petrarch's version is simply : "*cum in medijs opibus inops semper spiritu vixisset atque humilis.*"² Accordingly, though this *discreet* too may be satisfactorily enough interpreted as "wise," it is surely permissible to suggest that emphasizing as he does the woman's humility, patient benignity, and modesty of bearing, the poet meant rather to narrow the signification of the word to a form of wisdom not unlike that which Thomson's swain has been regarded as exhibiting.

¹ See the Chaucer Society's *Originals and Analogues of Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales,"* p. 159. ² *Ibid.*, p. 166.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 166.

At any rate the suggestive proximity of *discreet* to *benignitee* in this passage is not easily dismissed as purely accidental, for it has a parallel in another passage, in which we have as good, and indeed better, reasons for believing that a similar conjunction of *discreet* with *benigne* is significant. I refer to Chaucer's portrait of the Parson, of whom he declares that he was "in his teching discreet and benigne." But the phrase had best be read in its exact context:

And though he holy were, and vertuous,
He was to sinful man nat despitous,
Ne of his speche daungerous ne digne,
But in his teching discreet and benigne.
To drawn folk to heven by fairnesse
By good ensample, was his bisnesse;
But it were any persone obstinat,
What-so he were, of heigh or lowe estat,
Him wolde he snibben sharply for the nones.

(*Cant. Tales*—A 515-23.)

Now, it has evidently been considered satisfactory enough to understand the poet here as saying that the Parson was a wise (or shrewd) and kind teacher. But I submit that by the phrase "in his teching discreet and benigne" Chaucer meant to call up the image not so much of a wise *and* kind teacher as of a teacher whose wisdom, so to speak, consisted in gentleness and kindness. To interpret "discreet and benigne" as otherwise than strictly complementary to "not daungerous ne digne" of the preceding line is to miss Chaucer's point, which is simply that the Parson is not superior in his dealings with those less virtuous than himself, but is, on the contrary, extremely gentle and gracious. We are indeed told presently that he can be stern with obstinate sinners; but we are not, on that account, to see in this ability to adapt his manner to the nature of the sinner a justification for the teacher being called *discreet*. It is not because of his adaptability that the teacher, normally mild but sometimes stern also, is called *discreet*; for the epithet *discreet* is applied to him without any reference to the later remark, almost an afterthought, about the sternness which, in exceptional circumstances, he could assume. It is applied to him solely in his normal mood of a "nat despitous" nor "daungerous ne digne" reformer of the average sinner. The word, fortified as it is by "benigne," must, therefore, be taken as the exact opposite of "daungerous" or "digne"; it must be translated, not as "shrewd" or "discerning," or, vaguely, "wise," but as "gentle" or "kind."

But perhaps the clearest illustration of the use of the word in this

sense occurs in the following character-sketch of "faire damoysele Pertotele":

Curteys she was, discreet, and debonaire,
And compaignable, and bar hir-self so faire,
Sin thilke day that she was seven night old,
That trefwely she hath the herte in hold
Of Chauntecleer loken in every lith;
He loved hir so, that wel was him therwith.

(*Cant. Tales*—B. 4061-66.)

Here the epithets "curteys," "debonaire," and "compaignable," and the phrase "bar hir-self so faire" point unmistakably in the same direction, and it would be odd if this one epithet "discreet," which is in the midst of them and seems to have slipped in casually, should be meant to suggest the creature's prudence or wisdom rather than her affability or sweetness, which alone its fellows on either side indicate. Indeed, I cannot see what prevents us from believing that Chaucer here meant by "discreet" exactly what a later Border bard meant by it in the couplet:

Kind, hamely, social, frank, discreet,
Sic douce lail folk I ne'er did meet.

(James Watson: *Living Bards of the Border*, 1859.)

If this "discreet" is to be glossed "civil, courteous, obliging," as the *English Dialect Dictionary* glosses it, so too, it seems to me, must Chaucer's.

P. E. DUSTOOR.

MILTON'S TAPROBANE

A SIGNAL illustration of the failure to reckon with the chorographical information of the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries occurs in the interpretation of the following lines in *Paradise Regained*:

From India and the golden Chersoness,
And utmost Indian Isle Taprobane,
Dusk faces with white silken Turbants wreath'd: (IV., 74-76).

Almost all commentators, including Masson,¹ Browne,² Bradshaw,³ and Lockwood,⁴ to name a few, state positively that Taprobane is Ceylon. Mr. Allan H. Gilbert says: "Probably Milton thought

¹ *The Poetical Works of John Milton* (London, 1874), iii. 309.

² *English Poems by John Milton* (Oxford, 1875), ii. 313-314.

³ *The Poetical Works of John Milton* (London, 1878), ii. 670.

⁴ *Lexicon to the English Poetical Works of John Milton* (New York, 1907).

of Taprobane as Ceylon, as do modern geographers. It has also been identified with Sumatra. (Purchas, *Pilgrimage*, p. 658.)¹ To say that by Taprobane Milton meant Ceylon is to ignore the plain sense of the lines and the almost universal geographical opinion of the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries.

In the first place, what does Ortelius's *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*² say? Ortelius's map of Asia, "Asiæ Nova Descriptio," marks Sumatra "Samotra olim Taprobana" and Ceylon "Zeilan."³ His map of India, "Indiæ Orientalis, Insularumque Adiacentium Typus," has "Sumatra olim Taprobana," and Ceylon is marked "Zeilan ins: Tenarisim incolis dicta."⁴ In the description of Asia one reads: "Amongst infinite others, the principall isles ascribed to Asia, are Cyprus and Rhodes in the Mediterran sea; Zeilan of the vulgar and Taprobana well known to the ancients now called Samotra, but falsely Sumatra, in the Indick-Ocean." In the description of India, after an account of the Moluccas, one reads: "More neere the coast of India, is Sumatra, or rather Samotra, for so the King himselfe of that country, writeth it, in his letters unto his Maiesty: this Iland was knowne to the ancient Geographers and Historians by the name Taprobana." In Ortelius's "A Description of the Red Sea, now vulgarly called, The Indian Sea," one reads: "about the iland Taprobana, now called as generally all learned do thinke, Samotra, there are certaine fishes which do live partly upon sea and partly upon land." It is true that in Ortelius's *Parergon*, 1606, two maps, "Aevi Veteris, Typus Geographicus" and "The Peregrination of Ulysses," identify Taprobana with Ceylon; but clearly for Milton, as for his contemporaries, that location was antiquated. Besides, "utmost Indian Isle" describes Sumatra; it does not describe Ceylon.

Other evidence supports Ortelius. Mercator, in the "Second Description of the East-Indian Ilands," says, "Summatra lyeth

¹ *A Geographical Dictionary of Milton* (New Haven, 1919), p. 284.

² A study which I am now completing, and which will be illustrated with pertinent maps, shows not only that Ortelius's *Theatrum* was Milton's favourite atlas but also that the relationship between Milton's poetry and the maps is astonishingly intimate. Incidentally, an interesting reference to Ortelius occurs in *Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence, Against Smectymmaus*:

"Remonst. Alas we could tell you of China, Japan, Peru, Brasil, New England, Virginia, and a thousand others that never had any Bishops to this day.

"Answ. O do not foile your cause thus, and trouble Ortelius, . . ." (*The Works of John Milton* (New York, 1931), iii. 138). The casual introduction of Ortelius seems significant.

³ Folio 3 in the 1606, English, edition.

⁴ *Ibid.*, folio 108.

under the Aequinoctial line, . . . Aristotle in his booke *de Mundo*, calleth it *Taprobane*, and was by him esteemed to be the biggest Iland of the world."¹ In the 1623 Mercator the map of Asia has "*Sumatra olim Taprobana*," and the description runs: "*Septima tabula Insulas omnes in Oceano Indico & Orientali, varie dispersas complectitur. Inter quas Taprobana, & Zeilan . . .*"² Here *Taprobana* is used instead of *Sumatra*.

The position of *Taprobana* in Ptolemy's *Geographia* should be observed. In the Ptolemy with the old tables, for example that of 1482, 1490, and 1509, *Taprobana* is placed below India Intra Gangem, about where Ceylon is now. But in the Ptolemy of 1525, "*Tabula moder. Indiæ Orientalis*," *Taprobana* is an island off "*Mallagua*," in the position of *Sumatra*. Hereafter the new tables in Ptolemy always show *Taprobana* in the east. For example, in the Ptolemy of 1540 and 1542, *Tabula Asiæ XII* shows *Taprobana* with an insert of a huge elephant by a tree and this legend: "*Vartomannus Taprobanam insulam hodie vocant Sumatram*." In the 1562 Ptolemy the table "*Indiæ Taprobanæ Iavæ mariorisque & aliarum Insularum nova tabula*" shows *Taprobana* as *Sumatra*, and there is this description: "*In hac regione innumerabiles extant Insulæ, ut Sumatra, Taprobana olim. . .*"³ Incidentally it may be noted that A. E. Nordenskiöld's *Facsimile-Atlas* is an excellent place in which to study the relative positions of *Taprobana*.⁴ Francois de Belle-forest's *L'Histoire Universelle Du Monde* (1570) reads: "*Voisin de Malaca est l'ocean comme dit est, auquel tirant vers le Ponant, est assise le grand isle de Taprobane par les modernes apellee Sumatre, & de laquelle les anciens ont compte de si grandes choses*."⁵ In Theodor de Bry's *II Pars Indiæ Orientalis*, Chapter XXI, "*Argumentum Sumatra Insula, olim Taprobana dicta*," reads in part: "*Recta ex opposito Malacæ in Euroaphricum ad 10. milliaria a continente, in eo videlicet loco, ubi fretum est angustius, exierit sese Insula, quæ olim Taprobanæ nomine insignis fuit, hodie Sumatra dicta*."⁶ Describing his voyage to East India, Cæsar Frederick says: ". . . we passed without the Island Seilan, and went

¹ (1636), ii, 421-422.

² P. 37.

³ P. 57.

⁴ *Facsimile-Atlas to the Early History of Cartography with Reproductions of the most important Maps in the XV and XVI Centuries* . . . (Stockholm, 1889).

⁵ P. 57a. For this reference I am indebted to Professor D. T. Starnes, of the University of Texas.

⁶ P. 48.

through the channell of Sombrero, which is by the middle of the Iland of Sumatra, called in olde time Taprobana."¹

The dictionaries support the atlases and books of travel. Sir Thomas Elyot's *Bibliotheca Eliotæ* . . . (1548) states: "Taprobane, an ile in the Indian sea, . . . it is now called Samotra." Thomas Cooper's *Thesaurus Linguae Romanae & Britannicæ* (1565) makes the same statement. Edward Phillips' *The New World of Words* (1671) has the following statement: "Taprobane, an Island in the Indian Sea, . . . now called *Sumatra*." For good measure, add the explanation in "An Index of Hardest Words," appended to *Du Bartas His Deuine Weekes and Workes* Translated . . . by Iosuah Sylvester (1611): "*Taprobane*, An Iland under the Equinoctiall (now called *Sumatra*) Situate betweene Malaca and Iaua Maior."

The overwhelming weight of evidence in Milton's day identified Taprobane with Sumatra. Milton's phrase "utmost *Indian Iale*" points unmistakably to Sumatra. One glance at the map of India in Ortelius is all that is necessary to establish the point.

GEORGE W. WHITING.

ROBERT HOOKE ON HIS LITERARY CONTEMPORARIES

THE publication last year of the diary of Robert Hooke, first Curator of Experiments to the Royal Society and Surveyor to the City of London, has shown a new star in the constellation of Pepys. While justice has perhaps been done at his tercentenary to Hooke's genius in science, there has been no acclamation of a book which, clearly meant for private record only, is more entertaining than Evelyn, on the plane even of Pepys, and a fascinating exhibition of a life and its times. Since Hooke knew everyone who was worth knowing and a thousand who were not, his diary may prove to be an invaluable new check on current affairs and people. It extends in the transcript by Robinson and Adams² from August, 1672, to the end of 1680. A later diary, partially covering the years 1681 to 1693, has been edited by Dr. Gunther.³ There appear to be many errors in both transcriptions, and the index to the more important, earlier

¹ *The Principal Navigations Voyages Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation* . . . By Richard Hakluyt (Glasgow, 1904), v. 403.

² Taylor and Francis, London, 1935.

³ *Early Science in Oxford*, vols. VII, X.

diary (I have not tested the other) is quite inadequate. For such a packed and telegraphic book a full index is the first essential. It is hoped that the study of Hooke which I intend to undertake when I have completed this index, now in hand, may produce some interesting discoveries. Until the index is finished, any information derived from the diary must be fragmentary, but the following notes on Hooke's relations with some literary men of his day may serve at least to show the delight and profit of his writing.

He was on familiar terms with all of these literary men who were interested in science. Aubrey was a particular intimate. Hooke appears on the list of "Amici" drawn up by Aubrey,¹ and his life of Hooke is written in a tone of warm admiration which rises to agitated enthusiasm in a letter to Wood about Hooke's theory of gravity: "Mr. Wood: This is the greatest discovery in nature that ever was since the world's creation."² When he came to town Aubrey often lodged with Hooke at Gresham College, arranging for his letters to be forwarded there. During these visits the diary has daily references to Aubrey. They are, in Hooke's manner, laconic. The misfortune of March, 1673/4, could scarcely be more briefly chronicled: "March 5. Mr Aubrey arrested for £200." "March 9. Mr Aubrey cleerd &c." Aubrey's impecuniousness is displayed in these transactions of 1673: "Oct. 14. Lent Aubrey 20 sh., he promised to repay it." On November 20 Hooke bought books from Aubrey to the value of twenty shillings, acquitting the debt. "Nov. 25. Lent Mr Aubrey 20 sh. more."

But Aubrey's debts to his friend were most often intangible. Like everyone else at the time, they both loved good discourse, which was to be had in quantity from Fellows of the Royal Society. At the end of 1675 a club for discussion began forming within the Society, Hooke and Aubrey being among the chief creators. On December 11 "Mr Hill, Hoskins, Lodowick and I, at last Mr Aubrey discoursed about Mr Newtons new hypothesis" (of light). On December 18 they "Discoursd about Universal Character, about preadamits and of Creation. About Insects. I mentioned all vegetables to be femals. I told Wild and Aubrey of flying. Wild cold. Drank port." The zenith of omniscience was nearly reached on January 1, when Hooke becomes quite breathless in writing his account (too long to quote) of the conversation. On this occasion

¹ *Brief Lives*, Clark (1898), 1. 43.

² *Ibid.*, 415.

Aubrey was not present, but the book is full of such evenings, and Aubrey was very often there.

Naturally he supported Hooke in some disagreements with some officers of the Royal Society. There are traces of his being instructed how to work. "Oct. 9, 1677. Desired Mr Aubrey to spread the Designe of choosing new president to Mr Ent, Dr Millington, &c."

Wren and Hooke were among the first to see the survey of Surrey. Aubrey himself says he "enter'd upon the Perambulation of the County of Surrey July 1, 1673 and left off about the middle of September following."¹ Hooke's entry for September 13, 1673, records: "Aubrey returnd with description of Surry to Dr Wrens."

The latest reference which I have noticed is on October 5, 1680: "Aubrey impudent." This annoyance was ephemeral, since in the later diary Aubrey reappears on the old footing.²

With his fellow diarists, Evelyn and Pepys, Hooke was well, though not so intimately, acquainted. The comparative dullness of Evelyn is mirrored in the entries, which are of no interest unless they should happen to check any dates or facts. As surveyor Hooke was involved in the preliminaries over Mr. Godolphin's house,³ he presented Evelyn with a copy of his *Lampas* in October, 1676, and in November records his election, along with Pepys and others, to the Council of the Royal Society.

Pepys's admiration of Hooke is eloquent. It bursts out in a surprised antithesis after his first attendance as a Fellow at the Royal Society. "Above all, Mr. Boyle was at the meeting, and above him Mr. Hooke, who is the most, and promises the least, of any man in the world that ever I saw."⁴ This was in February, 1664/5. By the time of Hooke's diary Pepys was an important person whose graciousness was worth noting. Hooke was associated with one of his pet projects, the school for mathematical boys at Christ's Hospital. Pepys's zeal for this, like his admiration for Hooke, is interesting when one remembers his early struggles with the multiplication table under the instruction of the mate of the Royal Charles.⁵

¹ Quoted from Rawlinson's edition of the Surrey survey by John Britton in his *Memoir of Aubrey*, Wilts. Topogr. Soc., 1845.

² Of the nine references to Aubrey extracted in the preceding paragraphs only two appear in the index to the Diary.

³ See, particularly, Hooke, *Diary*, July 15-25, 1676, and Evelyn, *Diary*, September 12 and 19, 1676.

⁴ Pepys, *Diary*, February 15, 1664/5.

⁵ *Ibid.*, the month of July, 1662.

Hooke designed the badge for the school,¹ and was evidently concerned in its affairs for some time. He records many visits to Christ's Hospital and to various people about it. On August 28, 1676, he was "twice with Mr Pepys who was very civill and kind. I gave him module for Christchurch scoole and recommended Mercator for institution." On December 28 he was annoyed, perhaps about the school: "to Lord Brounckers about blew coat mathematicians. Moor a dog." (Sir Jonas Moore, who had just been made a Governor of the Hospital.) Leake, the master, had been put forward by the Royal Society, but the Fellows appear to have soon come to the same opinion of him as Pepys set forth in his crushing speech of October 22, 1677.² As early as May, 1674, Hooke is seeing Alderman Ward about Leake (May 1, 9), and three months earlier he epitomizes Pepys's future oration with the remark: "Mr Leake not performing as he ought" (January 23). He does not mention that October speech of Pepys, but dismisses another one briefly: "Dec. 19, 1676. . . . At Christ church . . . Mr Pepys . . . made a Long speech to noe great purpose."

The end of Pepys's service in the Admiralty is also briefly recorded, in the later diary: "Feb. 27, 1688/9. Pepys layd by." Mr. Pepys is kind on March 21, 1688/9, and on June 3, 1693, he is very kind, but "his kinsman vol." (Was he volatile, voluble, voluptuous, or misunderstood?)

Each appears to have appreciated the other on October 4, 1689: "Mr Pepys calld, proferd guin, which I refused. I shewd him severall optically Experiments: the Double Reflection of glass; the reason of the foci; the bringing in objects by the Telescope etc. He invited me to dine." Another entry about Pepys shows Hooke's ability to select other people's interests from his incredible range of topics: "June 15, 1689. To Dr Gale and Esqr. Pepys. Dind there . . . discoursd of Rowing, antient Shipping, of petrified wood, Lignum fossile, etc."

Wandering desultorily in and out of Hooke's pages is the strange figure of one of Pepys's enemies, Carkasse, who happened to have been a schoolfellow of Hooke's. Hooke is not enthusiastic about him: "April 19, 1677. Slipt Carkasse. . . . to Garways (coffee house), shammed Carkasse, Spent 16d." On October 5 he was trapped:

¹ Hooke, *Diary*, January 21 and 23, 1673/4. Arthur Bryant, *Samuel Pepys: The Years of Peril*, p. 101.

² Bryant, *op. cit.*, pp. 175-177.

"Carkasse to borrow money." Carkasse disappears on a note of contempt: "Dec. 14, 1678. Carkasse mad verses." (*Lucida Intercalla*, with its satire on Pepys, was published in 1679, according to the *D.N.B.*)

It cannot be said that Hooke shows any liking even for better poetry than Carkasse's. He rarely mentions any. I have found one reference to Dryden—"April 27, 1678. talkd with Dryden of Burlington" !—and none to his writing; two references to *Hudibras*: "Nov 13, 1677. Saw Hudibrasse," preceded by "July 30, 1674. Hudibrasse a Buffoon." It looks as though he shared Pepys's opinion of Butler. He probably knew Marvell,¹ but the only one of his works which he says he bought, *The Rehearsal Transposed*, he got rid of within twenty-four hours (December 5, 6, 1672). He may have thought more of Milton; at least he does not say he parted with "Miltons discourse" which he bought for 2s. 6d. on November 16, 1678. And finally, if the serious poets go without praise, the lighter weights do not escape censure: "June 25, 1675. Mr Hoskins and I at Shadwell. Atheistical wicked play 2½sh. wretch cold."²

¹ See my letter to the *Times Literary Supplement*, May 2, 1936.

² Neither Marvell nor Shadwell appears in the index.

MARGARET WATTIE.

note of
(*Lucida*
according

or better
e found
yden of
udibras :
O, 1674.
Pepys's
only one
sprosed,
1672).
t say he
6d. on
without
1675.
y 2½sh.

TTIE.

REVIEWS

Alliterative Poetry in Middle English : A survey of the traditions. By J. P. OAKDEN. Manchester University Press. 1935. Pp. x+403. 20s. net.

STUDENTS of Middle English will remember the publication in 1930 of Dr. Oakden's book on certain aspects (notably dialectal and metrical) of alliterative poetry. A companion volume dealing with the general content, vocabulary, and style of this genre is now before us.

The task here attempted by Dr. Oakden is a labour on the grand scale. His subject—a characterization, detailed analysis, and historical study of a distinctive body of Middle English verse—is in itself a great one. His aim is to appraise and illustrate the continuity between Old and Middle English alliterative poetry; and he supports his main theses with evidence that has an independent value, such as the long lists (p. 199ff.) of alliterative phrases used in various types of Old and Middle English literature. The work of reading texts and collecting the material was plainly vast—so vast that a book produced in the short term of five years could hardly be free from omissions and gaps of various kinds. In Dr. Oakden's book there are also serious faults of execution and method. One is left with mixed feelings—admiration for the ability to conceive and carry out such a splendid enterprise, and misgivings at the way in which parts of the work have been done.

The first section, which deals with "the poems as literature" and seems to have been intended partly, at least, for undergraduates, is of limited interest. Its general tenor shows insufficient insight into the literary background of Middle English and into the mediæval conception of literature. For instance, one doubts whether *Alexander A and B*, *The Wars of Alexander*, *The Destruction of Troye*, and *Morte Arthure* should be classified separately as "Chronicles in the Epic Manner" and distinguished from romances proper; and Dr. Oakden's belief that these alliterative poems were primarily chronicles is not well substantiated. *Morte Arthure*, for example,

has ornate and detailed specimens of the rhetorical description that is especially typical of romances rather than chansons de geste in Old French. Cf. the very elaborate account of the banquet, p. 170 ff., and the description of the giant, feature by feature, 1,075-1,103. On p. 32 Dr. Oakden says of *The Destruction of Troye*: "the author speaks contemptuously of Homer . . . and prefers . . . Guido de Colonna, who based his story on the work of Dares and Dictys, the historians. It is this attempt to convey historical truth that the reader has to keep in mind when trying to assess the value of the work." But Guido and Benoit also reject Homer, in obviously similar terms: ¹ the English poet was merely following his original, not (in this point, at any rate) "attempting to rewrite the ancient epic." He was repeating conventional mediæval references to literary authority.

Dr. Oakden is of the opinion (p. 106) that: "In the romance form the results are on the whole much more successful than the attempts of their southern and eastern predecessors and contemporaries. The treatment is more realistic, and more definitely English. There is no attempt to imitate the peculiarly French features of the romances, such as the elaborate analysis of feeling, the numerous digressions, and the extreme sentimentality." But it is just in regard to sentimentality and emotional analysis that Middle English romances in general, including those of the eastern and southern areas, differ from their old French models; and this point cannot be used to show that the alliterative poets were more English (though there may be other evidence).

Leading conclusions are stated in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2: "There is external evidence that alliterative long lines, both rhymed and unrhymed, were being used in popular verse on the eve of the Alliterative Revival. . . . There is thus an unbroken continuity in the alliterative prose tradition." We are given views of some interest and value, p. 74 ff., on *The Pearl*. Dr. Oakden sums up the various interpretations of the poem, and suggests (like Fletcher in *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, xx. 21) that the pearl symbolizes childlike innocence. This chapter ("The Poems of the Alliterative Revival") is one of the best in the book, along with

¹ Chaucer echoes this attitude in *House of Fame*, 1477-80:

Oon seyde, Omere made lyes,
Feyninge in his poetryes,
And was to Grekes favorable;
Therfor held he hit but fable.

the next ("The Alliterative School"). In the latter, Dr. Oakden shows close knowledge of the alliterative poetry and tabulates parallels in diction to illustrate various affinities within the group.

Chapter 6 ("A Study of the Nominal Poetic Compounds") is one of the weak points of the book. Dr. Oakden has made lists of "nominal poetic compounds," giving their etymology, and stating whether they are unique, confined to Middle English, found in prose or poetry, etc. He applies this both to the early M.E. alliterative works and to Lazamon's *Brut*, in an attempt to discover the extent of continuity with Old English. The idea is a good one; but the lists have been put together in careless fashion and the details are inaccurate:

burh-cnauen is translated "town lads," but referred to *būr* and *cnapa* (this being a misprint for *cnapa*), instead of *burh*, *burg*.

drinc-hail is not to be found in *La3. I*, 158.

gristbat: "I, 80 (*grist*+*bāt*)"; but the text reads *gristbatinge*.

sæ-oure: "*sæ*+*ār*" (without any explanation of the meaning of *ār*).

But both MSS. have the spelling *oure*: the word involved is O.E. *ofer*, "shore, bank."

elheowet: "*ēl*+*hēow*"; but the vowel in *el-* is short (**aljo-*). The marking of quantities is elsewhere erratic: *goddæd* for *gōddæd*; *gleodream*, but *glēoman*.

igraueston: *græf*+*stān*, or "engraved stone: *ze-grauen*." Both the initial *i* and the alternative etymology should be deleted. The context (*Marharete*, p. 22 in Cockayne's edition) shows that *i* represents the preposition *in*, wrongly spaced by a scribe.

laðer-clut: "H.M. 553 lather-cloth (*leaðor*+*clut*)."
The line reference implies the use of Furnivall's edition of *Hali Meidhad*, since Cockayne's (which the latter replaced) has no line numbering; but Furnivall reads *cader clutes* (cradle-cloths). *Laðer-clutes* in Bradley-Stratmann's dictionary is recorded only from this passage in Cockayne's edition (where the word is mentioned as a variant reading of MS. Bodl. 34). The Bodl. MS. undeniably reads *cader clutes* (fol. 67 r.); *laðer-clutes* is therefore a ghost-word (due to the similarity of *d* and *ð* in this MS.), and must be removed from the dictionaries and from this list of poetic compounds.

leoðebeie: "Jul. p. 16. **liðubez*. found elsewhere only in *Rel. I*. 188." Here the reference is wrong; read *Marharete*, p. 16. There is no need to quote a hypothetical form, for the word is found in O.E.—twice, as *lipebig(e)*, in Ælfric's homilies (see N.E.D. *litheby* and Bosworth-Toller). Moreover, it is not helpful to refer the reader to *Reliquiæ Antiquæ*, when the text concerned (*The Proverbs of Alfred*) has been separately edited in modern times.

speatewile: "(? *spittan* and *gewill*)."
This etymology will not do, for the *-i-* in O.E. *spittan* could not develop into *ea* in the language of the

Katherine-Group. A reasonable explanation of the word is given by Miss Mack in her edition of *St. Marharete*, pp. 20, 27, note, as being from *spæten* v. + *wil*. Alternatively, the etymology of Bradley-Stratmann (< *spæte-*) might have been invoked.

welsprung : "wylla"; but O.E. *wylla* means "will, wish, purpose," etc. The etymon is O.E. *wyll*, *well* : "a well, a spring, a fountain."

One of the better strokes is the comparison (pp. 172-4) of the two versions of *Lazamon's Brut*, showing how the later text corrupts or replaces archaic and poetical words and illustrating the obsolescence of the poetic diction within seventy years. This is an interesting and significant point (suggested, of course, by Professor Wyld's articles on the diction of *Lazamon*¹).

Chapter 8, "The Vocabulary of the Poems of the Alliterative Revival," contains some useful information. The most valuable section of the book is Part III ("The Alliterative Phrases"), with its lists of phrases in O.E. and M.E. For purposes of reference this is most helpful, since the material has never before been assembled; and Dr. Oakden has earned the gratitude of Middle English scholars for making it available. But one part, at least, of the lists (the section on the rhymed romances) is so incomplete as to give a wholly inadequate idea of the texts illustrated and to vitiate one or two of the author's conclusions. And one must protest against the antiquated editions here quoted. For *Amis and Amiloun*, *Sir Cleges*, *Degarre*, *Eglamour*, *Emare*, *Erl of Toulous*, *Le Bone Florence*, *Ipomedon*, *Ysumbras*, *Kyng of Tars*, *Launfal*, *Libeaus Disconus*, *Octavien*, *Orfeo*, *Richard Coeur de Lion*, *The Seven Sages*, and *Ywain and Gawain* Dr. Oakden has used, and actually refers us to, the collections of Ritson and Weber, though all these texts have been separately edited in more recent times. One of the earliest romances, *Arthur and Merlin*, has not been considered at all, nor has the late *Gowther*. One cannot concur in the view (p. 313) that because "of the sixty-three rhymed romances here examined, twenty alone antedate the Alliterative Revival, that is to say, were written before 1350," writers of the rhymed romances are likely to have borrowed their alliterative phrases from the alliterative group. It ignores the possibility that the rhymed romances may have had a tradition of their own in alliterative phrases. Such a tradition is probably indicated by at least one type of phrase, the characteristic development of which is not acknowledged by Dr. Oakden nor represented in his

¹ See *Language*, 1930, p. 1.

lists: the class illustrated by *comely vnder kelle*, etc. (see *infra*). The following phrases and further examples should be added (asterisks being used to denote phrases not included by Dr. Oakden at all):¹

**of blis bare*: SM 198, Am 1029, 2119, 2338, LD 2088, Ip 2204, OR 1835.

**bale bredde*: G 393.

bay and broune: 1 ex. quoted. Add LD 489.

blac and blo: 2 exx. quoted. Add *blo and blac*, KT 1219.

**blis or blame*: Ip 436.

blode and bone: add Am 142, Ip 973, 2063, 3773, 6028, 7670, 8574, TP 1881, 2556, 2364, G 550, 633.

bone and blode: no exx. are given from Ip (52, 763, 997, 2593).

blode and brayn: 2 exx. quoted. Add OR 2400.

brayn and blode: add KT 1208, OR 1646.

body and bon: G 450.

**borde and by*: SM 157.

borlich and bold: 1 ex. quoted; add *bolde and borely* PG 1098.

brag and bost: 3 exx. Add G 568, *brag ne bost*.

breme and bold: 1 ex. Add Ip 4079, 8842.

**breme and brathe*: G 108

brimes and bankes: 1 ex. Add Ip 1987, *brym and banke*.

broche and beize: quoted only from T. Add Deg 556, *broche ne bye*.

bryzt on ble: 1 ex. Add KT 389.

bryzte of ble: no exx. quoted from Ip, which has ten.

bryght and broune: 1 ex. Add Am 2465.

burde in boure: add Ip 2113, *byrdes in bowre*.

care(s) cold: 3 exx. Add G 546, Em 945, SM 596, Ip 7710.

couere of care: 3 exx. Add Y 488, G 745, Em 945, ET 384, Oc.B 522,

Eg 188, TP 334.

comly of kende: 2 exx. Add Am 110.

comely vnder kelle: 1 ex. Add G 33.

crake crounes: add H 1857, 1908, G 48, ST 157, T 887, Ip 5899, OR 1276.

dumb and defe: 1 ex. Add OR 1544.

**fele and fewe*: AM 6595.

**frelly fode*: Am 57, 557, 716, 2388, T 369, 2987, HC 776, KT 177.

**a frely to folde*: Deg 512; *that frely to folde* Deg 460. Cf. Em 939:

Frelly in armes to folde.

¹ Titles of texts are abbreviated thus: *Amis and Amiloun*, Am; *Arthour and Merlin*, AM; *Degarre*, D; *Degrevant*, Deg; *Eglamour*, Eg; *Emare*, Em; *Erl of Toulous*, ET; *Sir Firumbras* (Fillingham MS), F; *Gowther*, G; *Guy of Warwick* (15th-century version) GW; *Havelok*, H; *Horn Childe*, HC; *Ipomedon* (tail-rhyme version), Ip; *Ysumbras*, Y; *Ywain and Gawain*, YG; *Kyng Alisaunder*, KA; *Kyng of Tars*, KT; *Launfal*, L; *Le Bone Florence*, LBF; *Libeaus Disconus*, LD; *Octavien* (southern version), Oc; northern version, Oc.B; *Otuel and Roland* (Fillingham version), OR; *Perceval of Galles*, PG; *Richard Coeur de Lion*, RCL; *Sege of Melayne*, SM; *Sege of Troye*, ST; *Seven Sages*, SS; *Torrent of Portyngale*, TP; *Triamour*, Tr; *Tristrem*, T; *Roland and Vernagu*, RV.

- *fresche vpon folde : LBF 342.
 fresch to fist : LD 1943, 1966.
 frype and feu : G 468.
 *frythe and ferne : Ip 2471.
 frith and felde : 2 exx. Add Ip 3509, 4821, 6672.
 *gay and geld : LD 2100.
 *grene and gay : TP 1262.
 *godely vnpur gare : Em 198, 938.
 For "grymme and geyse Lib. Disc 597" read grimme and grise.
 great and grim : 2 exx.; add D 325. Add also grim and grete LD 1722, 2102.
 *grymly and grete : OR 727.
 *grymly gare : Am 1353, HC 213; *grymme gare Oc.B 1527; *with grymly growndyn gare, Y 459.
 *hande ouyr hedd : LBF 475.
 *hardy and hende : ST 69.
 hende in halle : only 3 exx. Add Y 1, Am 438, 2343, Ip 4875, Tr 1206.
 *vnder hest and vnder hond : SS 245.
 bi holtes and bi hille : 1 ex. Perhaps add TP 1378 (MS be hold and be hyl).
 "hool and hale SS 2302" : read hol and hail SS 2292, AM 350.
 *large and long : G 416.
 lyth and lymme : 1 ex. Add Ip 1621, 2409, 8403.
 *lythe of le : Em 348; lythe on le Em 834.
 londes or lythe : 3 exx. Add 7554, T 1640.
 *lord in lede : Am 2445.
 *myghtty vnder mayle : Ip 7046.
 *myne ne more : G 417. Cf. myre ne mos, Athelston 344.
 *nytyde with naye : Eg 129.
 *proud in play : KT 18.
 *pul or pande : Ip 6363.
 ren ne ryde : G 258.
 *repe a res : T 28.
 sadde and sore : 6 exx., but none from Ip, which has six : 1741, 3646, 3926, 4451, 4552, 7829.
 *scape and skec : AM 4726.
 *schake schaftes : T 885, G 42, ET 91, OR 1273.
 *scharpe schowre : GW 9206.
 *scharp and schille : LD 826.
 *schene in scheroude (for schroude) : Ip 387.
 see and sonde : Ip 2028.
 *semely vnpur serke : Em 501.
 *semelyeste vnder schroude : Ip 106.
 semly in sale : 1 ex. Add Am 1513, PG 1586.
 semly sale : 2 exx. Add LD 249, Am 1895.
 sorowe and syte : 3 exx. Add Oc.B 1305 (Lincoln MS).
 soure and siher : 1 ex. Add AM 7785.
 *staf and ston : ST 270.

- **stakworpe and store* : G 414.
- **stakwor3th in stoure* : Deg 1045, 1113.
- **stakworpe and stout* : ST 1866.
- stalleworthy on stede* : Ip 2042.
- **stakworthe vnder stel* : Ip 4435.
- stark and store* : 1 ex. Add D 762.
- **stef and strong* : AM 3465, 3988.
- **sterne to stere* : LBF 414.
- **stif and stelde* : LD 976.
- **stif and stoure* : LD 1344^k, Ip 1732.
- **styff vnder stele* : Ip 8771.
- **styffe and stere* : Ip 2957.
- **stipe and stille* : T 3280.
- **stythe in stowr* : G 413, 613, Eg 9.
- **stypen in stowre* : . G 613.
- stokkes and stonis* : 1 ex. ; add F 201.
- **stout and strong* : KT 1077 (Auch. only).
- strong and steryn* : 1 ex. ; add AM 2170.
- **swete and sware* LBF 90 ; **swete and sware* LBF 441.
- **swift and stepe* : AM 1450.
- **thyk ne thorn* : OR 1742.
- **tide and time* : AM 8059.
- treason and trechery* : 2 exx. Add RCL 6013.
- treye and tene* : add *tene and tray*, AM 9634.
- trusty and trewe* : 1 ex. Add Ip 206, 1713.
- **wayes and wodes* : KA 6646.
- **walk and wake* : Am 1941.
- **wapyn welde* : ST 837, SM 321.
- **waste and wylde* : LBF 1503, ST 274.
- **wekyd and wyght* : TP 1205, 1584.
- werre and wrake* : only 2 exx., from MA ; add RV 40.
- wyght in were* : 1 ex. Add in *werre wyghte*, Y 483, KA 1527.
- **wylle of won* : OCB 318, YG 2115.
- **wis inwoith wane* : Deg 433.
- **wys under wede* : Deg 220, 392.
- **wilde ne wighte* : PG 1183.
- **witles and wilde* : LD 188.
- **wyse and worthy* : Ip 2842.
- **wood and wilde* : SS 1452.
- **worthely in wone* : SM 168.
- **worpely won* : G 453.
- worthy yn wone* : 1 ex. ; add ET 1134.
- worthy and wyghte* : 3 exx., from SM ; add Ip 2909.
- worthy to welde* : 1 ex. ; add LBF 30.

This list is not an exhaustive record, but a collection of the most important phrases and the most necessary additional examples of phrases already mentioned by Dr. Oakden (as, for instance, when his

examples occur only in one text ; it is of some interest to know that a given phrase is not a haphazard collocation of a single poet). About 60 phrases are to be added to his lists. The claim (p. 315) that "as a whole the group is uninteresting, and contains no phrase that would not be expected in any important 14th (sic) text" conflicts with the testimony of the asterisked phrases above, of which many are not in the alliterative group. For *egge and ord* and *bi stretes and bi styte*, which are said to occur only in LD and Em respectively, cf. *orde of spere and swerdes egge*, KA 1836, and *stye and strete* D 1648—the same phrases, though in inverted or expanded form.

The interest of the supplementary phrases listed above is that :

1. Many occur only in one poem, and may have been coined by individual poets ; and if so, they prove the writers of the rhymed romances to have been resourceful and independent in the use of alliterative phrases. Cf. the interesting *lithe of le* in Em ; *blis or blame*, Ip 436 ; *proude in play* KT 18 ; *scape and skec*, AM ; *stif and stelde*, LD ; *swete and sware*, LBF ; *pul or pande*, Ip.

2. They include eight others of the same type as *comly vnder kelle* (attribute used with reference to some article of apparel) : *godely vnþur gore*, *myghitty vnder mayle*, *semely vnþer serke*, *semelyeste vnder schroude*, *stalworthe vnder stele*, *stif vnder stele*, *wys under wede*, along with the variant *schene in schrowde* ; and one or two belonging to the related type represented by *brizt in boure* (attribute in reference to circumstances or locality) ; *fresche vpon folde*, *proude in play*, *stalworþe in stoure*, *stalworþe on stede*, *stythe in stowr*, *worthely in wone*. The former class, most of the examples of which do not occur in the West Midland poems, seems to have been developed independently of the Western tradition. In the alliterative group (according to Dr. Oakden's lists), the examples are different : *lufsum vnder lyne* in *Gawain*, and *schene vnder scheild*, *Golagrus*, 639, 777, along with the variant type *proud in pall*, Minot's poems, and *worthly in wede*, *wlonkest in wedys*, *proudeste in palle*. Cf. further *Pearl*, 775, *comly onvnder cambe* ; and the following instances occur in lyrics (which, of course, are outside Dr. Oakden's field of study in this book) : *godlich ounder gore* (Carleton Brown, *English Lyrics of the XIIIth Century*, no. 51, l. 149), *glad vnder gore*, *ibid.* 76, 16, *geynest vnder gore*, *ibid.* 77, 35 ; *brihtest vnder bis*, *ibid.* 76, 17, and 139, 38.

The last section deals in detail with some characteristic points in

the style of Middle English alliterative poetry, and is useful. The statement (p. 394) that the "absolute construction attached to the sentence by means of 'and'" is peculiar to the *Gawain* poet and the author of *Death and Life*, who is thought to have imitated him, is not quite correct. Cf. *Destr. of Troye*, 396: *And she at hond for to haue husbond for age*.

Dr. Oakden should not be discouraged by these necessary criticisms, but rather be heartened by the knowledge that his subject and his treatment of it compel serious notice, and that his book, in spite of its faults, is of considerable worth. He would be well advised to revise the whole work thoroughly and put out another edition; with the errors eliminated and the gaps in Part III filled in by thorough and accurate reading of texts, it would be a solid and valuable contribution to Middle English scholarship.

G. V. SMITHERS.

Sir Henry Lee: An Elizabethan Portrait. By E. K. CHAMBERS. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1936. Pp. xii + 328, with 5 plates. 15s. net.

THIS biography is a solid and meticulously documented record of a man whose accomplishments as the "most complete Courtier of his Times" have impressed posterity less than his contemporaries. Sir Henry Lee's claims on the attention of the literary historian are slight. The most considerable pieces associated with his name are the Woodstock and Ditchley Entertainments—and it is doubtful whether Lee himself had a hand in the verbal score of either. His literary remains, in fact, consist of a few mediocre poems (of most of which, however, his authorship is uncertain) and a number of letters written in so opaque and cumbrous a style that no one except the philologist would wish to read more of them than the selection provided in this biography. For the rest, Lee figures as dedicatee of four minor works; he was the cousin of Sir Thomas Wyatt and he was acquainted with some half-dozen men of letters—Gascoigne, Dyer, Sidney, Greville, Painter, Richard Edes, and, probably, Peele, whose *Polyhymnia* commemorated Lee's retirement from the rôle of Queen's Champion in the Tilt. These, with a record in the Doncaster town accounts for 1574 of a payment of five shillings to "Sir Henry Lee's men, which did not playe," form the sum total of Lee's literary achievements and associations. There is no warrant

for assuming that he had any further interest in letters than as the hand-maid of spectacle and pageantry, and no evidence for supposing that he was either a patron, a lover, or a loved one of the Muses.

Lee's career was, within its limitations, successful. He was well-born, well-connected, and wealthy, and in spite of having shared the prevailing passion for house-building he died a rich man. He contributed to the princely pleasures of Elizabeth and her court the establishment of the annual tilt in honour of her accession "wherin still himselfe lead and Triumphed, caryinge away the Spoyles of Grace from his Sovereigne & Renowne from the Worlde for the fairest Man at Armes & most complete Courtier of his Times." He saw military service at home and served on various formal embassies abroad. In the words of his cousin and first biographer, William Scott, he "kept himself Reight & Steady in many dangerous Shockes & 3. utter Turnes of State." He performed the various offices that fell to his lot (the Lieutenantship of Woodstock, the Mastership of the Leash, and the Mastership of the Armoury) as well as his civic duties with a sense of responsibility and, although he failed to obtain the higher offices for which he hoped (the Vice-Chamberlainship and the Controllershship of the Household), his services were recognized in his election to the Order of the Garter. But in spite of this record Lee fails to interest. As biographical material, caution, industry, and reliability are deadly virtues which even Lee's prowess as a tilter and love of formal pageantry fail to quicken. Sir Edmund Chambers has resolutely refused to combine the rôle of showman with that of recorder, and has left Lee and the facts of his long and useful life to speak for themselves—and their accent is frigid. The picture of the Champion of the Tilt,

All in guilt armour, on his glistening Mazon
A stately Plume, of Orange mixt with Azure,

backed, as it was, with many solid virtues, commands respect but fails to excite interest or to stir the imagination.

The sub-title "An Elizabethan Portrait" gives the clue to the most interesting aspect of this biography, for it is as the picture of an Elizabethan, rather than as that of an individual, that Lee's life is interesting. Lee's record of ungrudging service and unswerving loyalty to the state provides an illuminating illustration of the manner in which domestic peace and security were assured in Elizabethan England. Lee and the many men who similarly enabled the in-

expensive machinery of Tudor government to work carried the burden that is now divided between civil service, police force, and standing army—mustering men for the suppression of rebellion and defence against invasion, administering justice and preserving order in their shires, and acting as unofficial news-agents on their travels abroad—who, if they could not soar with the hobby, desired (as Lee himself modestly put it) “rather to creape wth the pysmare than reste wth the dormouse.” There is, as well, the other side of the picture, of which the lives of men with whom Lee came in contact at Woodstock and the Armoury afford glimpses—of the petty jealousies, graft, corruption, and speculation that undermined efficiency, and the anxiety (from which even a man of Lee’s standing was not free) lest an error of judgment, absence from court, or failure to maintain contact with benefactors should result in loss of favour or position.

This biography naturally, therefore, contains much that will be of interest to the student of Tudor administrative and social history and (more especially in its opening chapter on the Lees of Quarrendon and its four appendices on the Lee family and family-monuments formerly in Quarrendon Chapel) much that will be of interest to the county historian and antiquary. Of more literary interest are Chapters IV–VI (“The Ranger of Woodstock,” “The Master of the Armoury,” “The Hermit of Ditchley”), which describe the Woodstock Entertainment of 1575, the occasional pieces commemorating Lee’s association with the Tilt, and the 1592 Ditchley (or Second Woodstock) Entertainment. Two appendices contain supplementary literary material: Appendix D, which provides a synopsis of the contents of the Ditchley MS. (now B.M. MS.Add. 41499A), a miscellany of occasional prose and verse mainly from tilt-yard and progress entertainments, and Appendix E which prints together for the first time, with collations of the four sources in which they are preserved, the fourteen known pieces in prose and verse that comprised the Ditchley Entertainment.

Though it is difficult to whip up much enthusiasm over Lee himself or over the personally allegorical, complimentary writings that characterized tilt and progress entertainments, the thoroughness of Lee’s biographer compels the admiration that his subject fails to kindle. The work is distinguished throughout by the range of its enquiry and information, its scrupulous documentation and its unflinching awareness of the lines of demarcation between fact, surmise,

and fiction. No one who has essayed a similar task can be blind to the amount of labour many chapters in the book must have involved. Much of the work that lies behind its packed and closely argued pages (such as the patient disentangling of the threads of the Lee pedigree) must have been particularly arduous. The work constitutes a handsome conclusion to Sir Edmund Chambers' earlier contributions to our knowledge of Lee in the *Elizabethan Stage* and the work of the late Viscount Dillon, whose MS. material, collected towards a similar end and now available at the Oxford County Hall, has been used to supplement Sir Edmund Chambers' own investigations into Lee's life; and to Sir Edmund Chambers and the press responsible for this handsomely produced book the reader is further indebted for five excellent plates which bring together portraits of the Lee family—two of Sir Henry Lee, of Margaret Lady Lee (his mother), Thomas Lee (the disorderly soldier of fortune, his cousin), and Anne Vavasour (Sir Henry's "dearest deare" and the solace of his later years).

Such errors as I have noticed are mainly superficial. The extracts from contemporary sources would have benefited from a further reading in proof, for although they are verbally accurate they contain a fair sprinkling of literal errors (double consonants for single, omission of final "e", etc.). It is curious that the reader is not informed from what MSS. the Ditchley pieces in Appendix E are printed: nos. i, iii-vi are obviously from the Ditchley MS., the sole authority here, but has the Ditchley MS. or (as seems to be the case) Hamper's text, based on the now lost Hamper MS., been used for those pieces which exist in both these MSS.? It might perhaps have been more satisfactory for those who like as close a reproduction as possible of contemporary punctuation and capitalization if some information had been given concerning the amount of editorial handling the extracts from contemporary sources have received, as the practice is, apparently, not uniform throughout the book; and the book's contents surely merited fuller and more consistent indexing. Lee's visit to Prague with Sidney and Greville, for example, in 1577 (pp. 46-7) is mentioned under Greville but not Sidney; Prague is not indexed. On the other hand, Antwerp, which Lee visited with Edward, Lord Windsor, in 1568 (p. 34), is indexed, but Lord Windsor is not. Again, pp. 51-2 contain references to a number of well-known political figures of the time (Mauvissière, Mendoza, Francis Throckmorton, Parry, Ballard,

Babington) which are not indexed, but many names of purely local interest (such as those on pp. 167-9) are. The "crowned pillar" poem quoted from Nichols' *Progresses* on p. 140, which Sir Edmund Chambers suggests may have had some connection with Lee's retirement from the Tilt, is from Puttenham's *Arte of English Poesie* (sig. N 2^v). In connection with the "Verses made by the earle of Oxforde and M^{rs} Ann Vauesor" (quoted on pp. 152-3) two further MS. sources may be noted—MS. Harl. 7392 (fol. 63^r), where the lines are subscribed "A. Vauasoure," and B.M. MS. Add. 28635 (fol. 72^v), where they are ascribed to the Earl of Oxford.

No one would claim, I think, that Lee was either an interesting or significant figure, but his biography might have been more stimulating and readable if the reader had not been left to coordinate, assess, and formulate for himself much of its significance. This seems to me a task which the reader cannot, legitimately, be expected to perform, for he is at a disadvantage, both in his lack of the biographer's intimate and long-standing acquaintance with the subject and in his ignorance of the mass of unrecorded information that always lies behind a work of this kind, on which the biographer alone can draw. It seems to me, therefore, that a biographer must either be prepared to make use of his advantage over his readers and risk a few generalizations to stimulate the reader's interest and steady his judgment or that he must chronicle *all* the information he has acquired so that the reader is as advantageously placed as himself to form opinions and draw conclusions. More guidance from the biographer as to where the emphasis should be placed might have helped Lee to dominate this biography and would certainly have relieved the reader of responsibilities which are not, I think, legitimately his.

Alice Walker.

Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age. By C. J. Sisson. Cambridge, at the University Press. 1936. Pp. xii+221. 12s. 6d. net.

Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age is an interesting piece of salvage work in Jacobean popular literature with a wider range of interest than its title suggests, for it contains, as well as an account of two lost plays, a number of hitherto unprinted works—two jigs, a ballad, and some half-dozen pieces of occasional verse (mainly satiric). The

miscellany has this in common : that the records of all the pieces here described (and, in the case of the shorter pieces, the works themselves) are preserved in contemporary lawsuits. Professor Sisson is to be congratulated on his initiative in discovering a little-explored territory where other "lost" works may well be preserved.

That neither of the two major works should have been found was not only a stroke of bad luck for Professor Sisson but also a general misfortune, for the first was a play by Chapman, *The Old Joiner of Aldgate*, a marriage-broking comedy produced early in 1603, and the second, *Keep the Widow Waking*, a sordid tragedy with an equally sordid "comic" sub-plot, written by Dekker, Rowley, Ford, and Webster in the summer of 1624. Both were apparently based on contemporary scandals involving London citizens, both were produced with a journalistic quick scent for copy, and the "scandalous" content of both was sufficiently apparent to bring their writers before the Star Chamber for slander. Though the plays themselves have been lost, the bills of indictment give a very clear idea not only of their main lines (in plot and *dramatis personæ*) but also of the circumstances of production, and incidentally provide a fair amount of new evidence on methods of collaboration, the relationship between dramatists and producers, the licensing of plays and ballads, and similar preliminary business before the play reached the public.

The shorter pieces, whose texts and commentary occupy the latter half of the book, include two jigs and provincial satires directed against the "unco guid" who endeavoured to balk the May games (at Wells), abolish the maypole (at Stratford), and cast the blight of puritanism on song and dance (in Nottingham). Undoubtedly the most interesting and important of these are the two jigs, *Michael and Frances*, a Yorkshire product, and *Fool's Fortune*, a particularly elaborate specimen of its kind, preserved in a Shropshire law-suit. The former is of particular interest both as the unique example of its kind known to have been "sunge by stage players as a Jigge vpon the staige at the end of their playe" and as a remarkably good illustration of the manner in which "a good Jyste" of a man and his maidservant was first composed so that his neighbours "might bee merrie in christmas withall," then circulated in manuscript and sung in private houses of the neighbourhood, and finally included in the repertory of travelling players.

Apart from the two jigs, which form a welcome and important

supplement to the scanty material available for the study of a once popular kind, the literary value of the shorter pieces is negligible. The specimens of provincial occasional verse (with the exception of the *Quintessence of Wit*) represent little more than rhymed records of local events and urban feuds that would now find a place in the Correspondence and Local News columns of provincial newspapers. In some the verbal score is doubtless but a part of a once livelier whole. The reader of the Nottinghamshire poem "My Muse Arise" is warned that it is "Better to be song, then to be redd to the tune of Bonny Nell," and perhaps William Gamage's description of the Wells May games, in which figures of classical mythology and biblical history mingled with the heroes of ballad and romance, pace-egggers, and Mother Bunch, who

puddings made as she went, through,
all the Towne in a wheele barrowe,

was more impressive when delivered in the manner described by one of the deponents :

with the action of his foote and hand, much like a player, which moved this deponent to thinke that the said verses had been a parte of some play.

But although the Record Office has here failed to yield anything of intrinsic merit, the material collected by Professor Sisson is instructive. It provides an entertaining reminder of the mass of occasional verse that was produced and circulated (orally and in manuscript) in the early seventeenth century. More important, it provides indubitable evidence of the literary exploitation of topical and local scandal and it explains the fear and contempt with which makers of plays, ballads, and jigs are so frequently mentioned in late Elizabethan and Jacobean literature. Chapman's play was the revenge of a disappointed suitor, who was alleged to have furnished the dramatist with the plot ; Michael Steel's neighbours in the North Riding made merry over his domestic affairs in the jig of *Michael and Frances* ; and the ballad of *Keep the Widow Waking* (preserved among the Star Chamber records as, unfortunately, the play was not) was provocatively sung by the ballad-monger under the window of the unfortunate widow. Professor Sisson has wisely recorded these pieces in the settings in which they are preserved, and they emerge from his handling not as antiquarian exhibits but as lively specimens of a vigorous satiric literature which flourished throughout the country. *Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age* is therefore primarily a

study of the springs of popular literature in Jacobean England. Some of them are particularly foul. The story of greed and degradation which formed the "comic" sub-plot of *Keep the Widow Waking* is dredged up from the "putrid slime" that both repelled and fascinated late Elizabethan and Jacobean writers. In the provinces the Castalian springs flowed more clearly, and merry night-catches in Nottingham and high-spirited May games at Wells provide a welcome relief from the sordid intrigues and brutal crimes that provided copy for the London stage. It is part of Professor Sisson's intention to portray in some detail the background against which these pieces should be set, and the circumstantial details of these legal records provide some vivid pictures of middle and lower class life in town and country and some pleasing specimens of Elizabethan idiom.

The texts I have examined (the two jigs) are not meticulously recorded. They contain a fair number of spelling errors, though verbal errors are few: *what* for *where* (*Michael and Frances*, p. 139, l. 25), *this* . . . *picture* for *thes* . . . *pictures* (*Fool's Fortune*, p. 149, l. 16) and *spoils* for *spoile* (*ibid.*), p. 153, l. 5), which should not have escaped correction as it mars the rhyme, are all that I have noticed. As a whole, however, *Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age* is a solid and substantial work, well indexed, well documented, and vigorously written; and its material, which touches Jacobean life and letters at more points than any reviewer can hope to enumerate, is, above all, presented with admirable showmanship.

ALICE WALKER.

Der aufgeklärte Puritanismus Daniel Defoes. By RUDOLF STAMM. Zürich und Leipzig: Max Niehans Verlag. 1936. (*Swiss Studies in English* edited by B. Fehr, O. Funke, H. Lüdeke, volume I.) Pp. 343. Swiss fr., 15; RM. 12.70.

THE problem of Defoe's religious sincerity will always call for investigation from fresh points of view. Herr Stamm's solution is that the author of *Robinson Crusoe*, living in an age in which rationalism was coming into life and in which Puritanism had already lost much of its original severity, was compelled by circumstances and by his ambition to be both a Puritan and a rationalist. The author examines Defoe's theory and practice in politics, theology, ethics, literature, and in tradesmanship. It is in the first chapter

that Herr Stamm deals with the greatest difficulties of his subject. Defoe's inconsistencies cannot all of them be explained simply by the alternate victory of reason and of religion. The author justly emphasizes the slackening of the old Calvinistic spirit: Hartley's agent, therefore, may not have felt guilty of betraying his convictions for material benefit; and this moral obtuseness, together with the loss of the old discipline of self-examination, make the paradox of Defoe's "enlightened Puritanism" possible. Any scruples that might have made him hesitate were silenced by sophisms, and this was all the easier because Defoe was fatally prone to delude himself. The author discusses the major examples of Defoe's political inconsistency, and in the exposure of his true motives lies the chief merit of this book.

The second chapter deals with Defoe's Calvinistic orthodoxy, which is shown to have been forced upon him not as an experiential necessity but rather as the only way in which as a thorough realist he could conceive ethical sanctions. In feeling he was a deist, but his very reason forbade him the slightest digression from revealed doctrine. Defoe's orthodox belief is of a singularly enlightened type. He defends the articles of his creed by purely rational arguments, and the only emotional belief of which he is capable is his faith in reason. This lack of genuine religious feeling is chiefly responsible for his moral defects.

Herr Stamm shows acute judgment in the interpretation of the inroads made by rationalism upon the old Presbyterian ethics. At times he seems, however, to lay too much stress on the "modernity" of Defoe's views and to overlook that self-centred coldness of feeling which, of course, does not lie on the surface of Defoe's writings, but can be inferred from reading him. The author sometimes tends to found his criticism on a too literal reading of the texts and to neglect the tone in which they are written. In this respect M. Dottin, with whom Herr Stamm falls out, proves to be a more sensitive reader. The fundamental change, however, which the Puritan doctrine undergoes in Defoe's views on family relations has never been expounded more convincingly than by Herr Stamm. It appears, though, that sometimes Defoe's "enlightenment" prevails *in spite* of his Calvinistic feelings; the persistence of the sterner creed is duly noted by the author of this book, but he is liable to make it more a matter of Defoe's desire to remain orthodox than to recognize it as an essential part of the whole man.

When treating Defoe the poet and novelist, Herr Stamm reduces everything to two main characteristics: Defoe's ability to assume different personalities and his command of realistic detail. The former is explained from the peculiar situation in which Defoe found himself; standing between Puritanism and rationalism he had no fixed point of view himself and found it, therefore, easy to adopt other men's points of view. It seems more likely—if, indeed, Defoe's literary genius can be explained from these two components alone—that the realistic power is primary and that his peculiar faculty for assuming other characters derives from it. Herr Stamm, however, is chiefly concerned with the disparity between the pious or didactic intention and the æsthetic effect, and he gives a shrewd analysis of the arguments with which Defoe endeavoured to justify his lapses into fiction. An interesting line of development which shows Defoe gradually freeing himself from his earlier purely moral bias is then followed up: its first stage is seen to be attained in *Robinson Crusoe* and, in 1727, it has reached its highest point with the admission that "Fables, feigned Histories, invented Tales, and even such as we call Romances, have always been allow'd as the most pungent Way of writing or speaking; the most apt to make Impressions upon the Mind, and open the Door to the just Inferences and Improvement which was to be made of them" (p. 284).

The incompatibility of the Christian doctrine with certain necessities of commercial efficiency is generally resolved by the *Complete English Tradesman* in favour of the latter. It is, however, proved clearly that the decisions were not arrived at without conflict and a lingering sense of the sinfulness inevitably bound up with material prosperity.

Herr Stamm's book is a thorough and carefully documented exploration of the mystery of Defoe's personality. It concludes that Defoe was constitutionally a modern, liberal-minded, rationalistic thinker who tried his best to curb his instinctive optimism by considering man's worthlessness in the face of God and by adhering to an orthodoxy which became more stubborn with the growing rationalism of the century. His reluctance to give up either of these contradictory views led to all the inconsistencies of which his life is so full. The author believes that he has rehabilitated Defoe by showing that the conflicts in his personality were merely an image of the more general struggle between Puritanism and rationalism which was going on in his time. This

sort of rehabilitation will, of course, not convince everybody. Herr Stamm could make a better claim to have rehabilitated Defoe: his analysis of the real motives behind Defoe's sayings and actions goes in many cases deeper than any other explanation of him which has so far been attempted.

H. W. HÄUSERMANN.

The Mind and Art of Jonathan Swift. By RICARDO QUINTANA.
London & New York: Oxford University Press. 1936.
Pp. xii+398. 16s. net; \$3.75.

"It is not as you think—look!" Thus Mr. Quintana ends his study of Swift's mind and art, discovering his intellectual greatness in the intensity of his "moral realism," his artistic greatness "in the incomparable matching of substance and voice." It is well said; and Mr. Quintana has succeeded not only in writing an interesting book, but one of the soundest of the several recent studies of Swift. Essays in the study of Swift's life, character, and art have been published almost yearly for some time past; and it is natural to compare Mr. Quintana's book with that by Mr. Carl Van Doren, also an American, which appeared in 1931. The earlier work, briefer in content, is essentially biography, told as far as possible in Swift's own words, subordinating the author's interpretation of his hero's character to narrative. So far as interpretation is pressed, the portrait of Swift is not unlike the accepted picture of the proud and embittered misanthrope. Mr. Quintana, as the title of his book indicates, chooses the rôle of the interpreter, and, following the swing of the pendulum, which has been moving further and further from the harsher estimate, he draws a portrait from which pride, disillusionment, and misanthropy have been displaced by a positive belief in the moral reasonableness of man.

The more human and kindly conception of Swift has never been more persuasively presented than by Professor D. Nichol Smith in a paper, *Jonathan Swift: Some Observations*, read before the Royal Society of Literature in March, 1935; and Mr. Quintana's presentation of Swift's character is closely linked with that of Dr. Nichol Smith, who believes that "Swift was a definitely religious man" imbued with "an overmastering sense of the weakness of human nature." If we recognize that, in Swift's apprehension, religion was primarily a moral force, Mr. Quintana's emphasis upon the

tremendous earnestness and realism of Swift carries him to the same conclusion.

Swift's tracts on religion were inspired by a conviction that man's primary need was a rational and ordered morality within the body politic, his political pamphlets by a belief in reasoned justice and liberty. Religion and government were capable of demonstration to ordinary men. He mistrusted intellectual flights and philosophic utopias. But his conception of justice and liberty subordinated dissentients to the consensus of the majority. He was not intolerant of contrary opinion save when it became aggressive or subversive. He lashed Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, and Deists not because of their opinions, but because they imperilled the order of society. A man who keeps poisons in his cabinet can be safely ignored until he begins to vend them for cordials.

The conventional portrait of Swift as the disillusioned and savage satirist will not bear examination. It will not stand the test of an informed reading of his major works, *A Tale of a Tub* and *Gulliver's Travels*, of his many pamphlets, or of his verse. Nor can we neglect to remember the lifelong, trusting friendship he inspired in many men and women. His familiar letters and verse epistles bespeak a natural ease in friendly relationships. As Dr. Nichol Smith observes: "What he said in print we understand better by knowing what he said intimately to his friends."

Swift championed the Anglican Establishment not merely as an officer of the Church, but because he accepted its doctrines sincerely and found in its national character the best order for Englishmen. His religion was part of himself and of his ideology. *A Tale of a Tub*, which horrified some of its first readers, which to many, even now, seems grossly irreverent, was a satire not on belief but on "the gross corruptions in Religion and Learning." *Gulliver's Travels*, which has earned for him the character of the gloomy misanthrope, he regarded as a book which would "wonderfully mend the World." The very trenchancy and wit of Swift's satire has obscured for the average reader its depth and sincerity of purpose.

A satirist Swift was; and, when roused, savagely intolerant. A cynic he was not. Until the last years, when idiosyncrasies grew upon him, he was a friendly man of social interests. The confirmed cynic is not, as was Swift, the champion of morality, good order, liberty, and justice. Are we justified in asserting further that faith and hope, behind the guise of the satirist, animated Swift? Is this

what lay hidden behind the mask? This it is not so easy to believe. That he was disappointed, not contented with the turn of events in his own life, is abundantly manifest. He was, in consequence, not always just to those whose religion and politics were not his own. As a moralist he betrays no hopefulness in the destiny of man or of faith in a future event. Nor are we conscious that religion, save as a moral control, supported him through life. In any re-assessment of values we must not allow the swing of the pendulum to carry us too far. A man may well enjoy the passing hour, he may find happiness in the companionship of his fellows, he may be guided by high motives, he may sacrifice himself in the public interest, and yet, in the secret places of his heart, think of life as an evil, a game which in the end must be lost.

The gift of life Swift never prized. "I do not think life of much value," he tells one of his oldest friends. "I never wake without feeling life a more insignificant thing than it was the day before," he writes to Bolingbroke. And how unforgettably this despair is manifest in the picture of the Struldbruggs. The possibility of discovering the secret of an immortality on earth has fascinated men from the beginning. Swift dissipates the dream of felicity. Perpetuity of life would only be desirable if a man could "chuse to be always in the Prime of Youth, attended with Prosperity and Health." But the Struldbruggs are vicious old dotards, dragging out a pitiable existence, cut off from the life of men by the passage of the generations, "living like Foreigners in their own Country."

The compelling force of Swift's character and genius will elude us if the harsher outlines are always agreeably subdued. In presenting a saner estimate of Swift Mr. Quintana has not escaped the danger of over-emphasis in the kindlier direction; but he has, on the whole, written a balanced and judicious book. He can think for himself; he writes with reserve; and he refrains from justifying his statements by contesting the judgment of preceding commentators. If sometimes preconceived theory prevents him seeing the whole, his interpretation of Swift's mind and art shows that he can see clearly.

Mr. Quintana warns the reader that he has entered into no "vexing problems of authorship," and has avoided assigning to Swift questionable pieces. In this respect he has not, however, quite lived up to his profession. He cites (p. 47) lines on the burning of Whitehall in 1698 as one of the earliest examples of Swift's natural

style in verse. But there is no evidence available that these lines are by Swift, and the revolutionary sentiments make his authorship at any time extremely improbable. Whether Swift had any part in *A Town Eclogue* (p. 187) is also doubtful. *An Excellent New Song upon the Late Grand Jury* (p. 269) is attributed unhesitatingly to Swift. This piece was assigned to him by Scott in 1814, and then only upon supposition. There is no evidence, internal or external, to connect the ballad with Swift. The inferiority of matter and style also leaves it very doubtful if *Will. Wood's Petition* (p. 269) can be by Swift. There is no evidence that *To the Honourable Mr. D. T.* (p. 271) is by Swift, and some possibility that it was written by Sheridan. The authenticity of *A Wicked Treasonable Libel* (p. 276) may also be doubted.

A few slips may be noted. In the quotation from *The Description of an Irish Feast* on p. 284 the word "But" in the penultimate line should be "By." On pp. 333-4 "Mrs. Masham" is named four times in error for "Mrs. Howard." *Death and Daphne* (p. 359) was written of Lady Acheson, not of Mrs. Pilkington. On p. 368 Dean Smedley's Christian name is twice given as "Hugh." It should be "Jonathan." And is Mr. Quintana quite satisfied in his own mind that "Swift's compliance with the Addisonian canons yielded verse for which there can be only praise" (p. 163)? Was Prior's "familiar style" passed on to Swift (p. 203)? It is difficult to trace a justification for these statements, and good reason to concede Swift's own claim that he was never known to steal a hint, "but what he writ was all his own."

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

Thomas De Quincey. A Biography. By H. AINSWORTH EATON. London: Oxford University Press. 1936. Pp. xvi+542. Illustrated. 24s. net.

THOUGH not without defects, this is a useful book, the fruit, evidently, of years of devoted labour. It sets before us with scrupulous exactness nearly if not quite all the ascertainable facts about De Quincey's long, tortuous, and often almost subterranean career; and if here and there we may question the interpretation which is put upon them, this matters little, since Mr. Eaton's avowed purpose has been to furnish not so much judgment (whether literary or biographical) as ordered materials for judgment. As Boswell, Lockhart,

and Masson are the regular quarries for critics and small-scale biographers of Johnson, Scott, and Milton, so for a long time to come Mr. Eaton, in place of the useful but now antiquated A. H. Japp, will be the recognized authority consulted by all students of De Quincey. It is, by the way, a matter for some regret that Mr. E. Sackville West published his admirable critical and psychological study, *A Flame in Sunlight* (1936), just too soon to profit by the fuller and more trustworthy information now made available.

Mr. Eaton himself has not absolutely eschewed criticism, but he has attempted little in this way, and it is just as well. Regular literary criticism has little business in a full-length "chronicle-biography" of this type; it is only tolerable when the career dealt with is a short one—those of Keats and Shelley, for instance. Moreover, there is, it must be said, a certain naivety in some of Mr. Eaton's critical pronouncements. He thinks that the first part of *Murder as One of the Fine Arts* is "in the best style of ironic humour," and remarks, concerning the absence of wit in De Quincey, "his mental processes were too massive for electric expressions"—whatever they may be. (It is fair to add in passing that lapses of this kind are not frequent, though the phrasing is now and then rather clumsy.) In trying to account for the failure of De Quincey's literary criticism to sustain the high level of the essay *On the Knocking at the Gate in Macbeth* Mr. Eaton does not notice the suggestion, made many years ago by Saintsbury, that De Quincey was in reality more interested in the ideas *in* poetry—especially philosophical and psychological ideas—than in poetry *as* poetry, a remark which sufficiently explains his inferiority here to Lamb, Hazlitt, and Coleridge, all of whom he excels, at his rare best, as a prose stylist.

But to revert to our proper concern. I have called Mr. Eaton's book a "chronicle-biography," thereby assigning it, of course, to the class of which Boswell is the supreme exemplar, and works like Mr. Howe's *Hazlitt* and Mr. Blunden's *Leigh Hunt* honourable specimens of more recent date. In this class Mr. Eaton attains a level amply sufficient to give his work (in Matthew Arnold's phrase) a "proper reason for existing"; but he falls a good deal below Mr. Howe and Mr. Blunden on account of certain faults of proportion and perspective. Of these it is necessary, in fairness, to give some instances in support of judgment.

One main difficulty concerns the amount of space to be allotted to the various periods in De Quincey's life. Mr. Eaton, like most

of us in these days of Research with a big R, is enslaved a little to the fetish of "new material," and it happens—not surprisingly though rather unluckily—that most of the unpublished documents he has hunted out belong either to the *Convention of Cintra* period (1809) or to that of the later relations (after 1830) between De Quincey and the Blackwoods. Now I would not for a moment suggest that the presentation of these is in itself too detailed, for the new letters are both interesting in themselves and valuable for the fresh information they yield. But to make room for them and in the endeavour (mistaken as it seems to me) to keep the whole work within the compass of a single volume, Mr. Eaton has unduly curtailed the space assigned to other and more vitally important episodes concerning which he has little new material to offer. "There are long stretches in the following pages," says his needless apology in the Preface, "which are inevitably 'old stuff'"; but an attitude like this is bound to upset the proportions of the work as a whole, and a reader not already fairly familiar with the life of De Quincey will be given a partly wrong impression.

The most unsatisfactory section of the book is the treatment (Chapters IV, V, and VI) of the famous and still very mysterious episode of the "elopement" from the Manchester Grammar School and the wanderings in Wales and London which followed. There are, as has often been noticed, serious discrepancies both in the *Confessions* account itself and between that and the recently discovered diary kept by De Quincey in 1803 just after the weeks of semi-starvation in London. Yet though Mr. Eaton himself was the editor of the diary on its first appearance in 1927, he makes but little attempt to tackle the difficult problems which it raises. Why, for instance, does it not only contain no reference to Ann, but practically no sign whatever that the writer had just passed through a tremendous emotional crisis and a period of hardship which might be expected to have seriously affected both his physical and his mental health for at least several years? In a favourite phrase of Mr. Eaton's, "there is no answer," though we might surely look for some sort of provisional guess at one, however hesitatingly offered. My own impression is that De Quincey did, writing many years later, greatly exaggerate his sufferings, and that the disentanglement of fiction from fact in the *Confessions* is a problem perhaps insoluble, but certainly deserving much more hard work than has yet been devoted to it. Mr. Sackville West has made a start with his inspired, though as yet

unconfirmed, theory that De Quincey consciously or unconsciously suppressed the real motive of his cutting himself off from his family in 1802, which was a fear of being accused of stealing the famous "forty-guinea letter" sent to him by mistake before he left Manchester. This seems to me convincing, as far as it goes; but it is rather disappointing to find that Mr. Eaton not only does not consider it (though *A Flame in Sunlight* appears in his bibliography) but has no alternative theory of his own to put forward.

A less vital but still unfortunate weakness is the skimpy treatment in Chapter XIV of De Quincey's brief but interesting connection with the *London Magazine* and its circle of eminent contributors. Here Mr. Eaton has failed to make full use of the printed sources available. The letters and reminiscences of Procter (and his friend Beddoes), Clare, and Hood, then sub-editor, would all have yielded some material—not much, but valuable in view of the comparative scarcity of allusions to De Quincey by his contemporaries until his last years.¹ More, also, might have been made of the evidence obtainable from Hazlitt and Crabb Robinson; for instance, a much clearer account of the dispute between De Quincey and Hazlitt in 1823 will be found in Mr. Howe's *Life of Hazlitt* (ed. 1922, pp. 363-4). One observes hereabouts a certain shyness in face of hostile contemporary opinions of De Quincey's character and temperament which cannot be commended in a biographer.

Indeed, I feel some doubt (though it is well not to be too dogmatic here) whether Mr. Eaton does not almost throughout yield too readily to the temptation to "whitewash" his hero—in common, no doubt, with many other writers on De Quincey, nearly all of whom seem to fall victims to the strange charm of this in many ways reprehensible little man. Granted there is nothing to cavil at in the account of his uncomfortable relations with the Wordsworths, which does justice, so far as that is humanly possible, to all concerned. But Coleridge is rather hardly used. Certainly it is true in a sense that both men spoiled their lives with opium; but Coleridge saved far more from the wreckage than De Quincey did. Morally, no doubt, there is little to choose between them; but it makes some difference that Coleridge's most trying demands on the forbearance of his relatives and friends came *after* it was clear to

¹ A few lines from Hood's *Literary Reminiscences* (written in 1839) are quoted, out of their proper place, on p. 446; but the best parts of this vivid and by no means unfriendly sketch are not given. The whole of Hood's *Reminiscences* are reprinted in *Thomas Hood and Charles Lamb*, ed. W. Jerrold, 1930.

most of them that he was a man of genius, while De Quincey had made a sad mess of almost everything *before* he wrote anything of the slightest consequence. I feel therefore that, in his anxiety to give full value to what excuses are possible for De Quincey's drug-taking and improvidence, Mr. Eaton fails to do real justice to the selfless devotion of his wife (who in 1830 was almost driven to suicide by her entirely undeserved miseries) and to the always well-meaning and unselfish if sometimes not very intelligent affection of his mother and his uncle, Colonel Penson. The plain truth is that De Quincey and his large family would have starved twenty times over but for solid and continuous help from both of these relatives—in view of which his behaviour on his uncle's death in 1835 and the remarks about his mother printed in a footnote on p. 365 do not make very savoury reading.

Mr. Eaton does not *suppress* such evidence, and that is a great merit; but he does not always give it its proper weight, and sometimes his comments are unduly mild. When the long-suffering William Blackwood, driven to desperation by De Quincey's procrastinating habits and his innumerable and interminable explanatory "notes," rather brusquely suggests that his contributor should write less often and more briefly, Mr. Eaton's comment (p. 353) is: "De Quincey felt a lack of sympathy"! (The mystery is how he managed to retain his connection with *Blackwood's Magazine* for anything like so long.) Again, in recording faithfully and fully De Quincey's almost incredibly malicious remarks to Richard Woodhouse about John Wilson in 1821 (pp. 281-5), Mr. Eaton strangely fails to draw clearly the obvious inference that De Quincey was simply consumed with envy of his friend's success and was seeking excuses for his own failure to gain a footing on *Blackwood's* by nursing unfounded suspicions that Wilson had spoken ill of him in Edinburgh. A recent study of Wilson, Miss Elsie Swann's *Christopher North* (1934), which does not appear in the bibliography, might have helped Mr. Eaton to paint a clearer picture of that rather pathetic swashbuckler, particularly regarding the scandalous jobbery of his appointment to the chair of Moral Philosophy at Edinburgh.

A few notes on misprints and other small details may be added. Only one point is of much consequence. Like everybody else except Mr. Sackville West, Mr. Eaton has made nonsense of Heading 9 in the "Constituents of Human Happiness" jotted down by De Quincey in 1805, by following Japp's reading of the MS. as

"contempt" when it should evidently be "contemplation." It is impossible to make anything of "contempt," as Mr. Eaton's paragraph of desperate struggle shows all too clearly, and it is to be hoped that all future students will accept the emendation.

The remaining points are : p. 16, end of note 40, "taken" read "take"; p. 25, near foot, "Louthenbourg" read "Louthenbourg"; p. 112, note 11, "Schwartzburg" read "Schwartz-"; p. 140, near foot, "*White Doe of Rylestone*" read "*Rylstone*"; p. 208, note 67, "Crab" read "Crabb"; p. 279, top, "Hamilton, Reynolds" read "John Hamilton Reynolds"; p. 301, line 25, "vanished" read "vanishes"; p. 325, line 2, "year" read "a year"; p. 349, line 19, "mysterious" read "mysteriously"; p. 357, near end, "that by accident, or in partial sense" read (as in Japp) "that which by accident, or in some partial sense"; p. 405, line 26, "affects" read "effects"; p. 419, note 9, "of" read "to."

The index is adequate, though it might have been fuller with advantage.

R. W. KING.

An Odyssey of the Soul : Shelley's Alastor. By HAROLD LEROY HOFFMAN. New York : Columbia University Press ; London : H. Milford. 1933. Pp. viii+173. 16s. 6d. net.

By his method of procedure, as well as by a number of loyal allusions, Mr. Hoffman reveals his discipleship to Professor Lowes, the author of *The Road to Xanadu*, who alone, he thinks, could follow Shelley's mental processes "with consummate skill." The reader will feel, on the contrary, that Mr. Hoffman has done everything that skill could accomplish. The difficulty is that even his ingenuity cannot discover what is not there.

The poet, like other human beings, is the creature of environment. The language in which he writes was first learned from others, and the fact that Shelley wrote in English and not in a language of his own invention is proof in itself of the operation of external influences upon his mind. Every book that he read must have made its contribution to his intellectual experience, and as his imagery is reflected from that experience it is natural that ideas derived from books should have found their way into the structure of the poem. It does not follow that they are present in a recognizable form or that they can be traced through stages of evolution. Shelley himself,

in his *Defence of Poetry*, speaks of the imagination as composing from thoughts, "as from elements, other thoughts, each containing within itself the principle of its own integrity." These "other thoughts" are not simple modifications of the thought which brought them into being, but, as Shelley insists, new creations. If that is not admitted we must cease to speak of the imagination as the creative faculty.

Shelley, who would certainly have assented to that definition, considers poetry to be "the expression of the imagination." Either he is wrong or his practice must be sadly at variance with his theory if we can detect in *Alastor* the influence here of Mrs. Radcliffe or some other novelist, there of Berkeley or some other philosopher, here of the *Excursion* and there of the *Ancient Mariner*, here of the Book of Genesis read in the Authorized Version and there of the same book read in the Septuagint. The question is not whether these "elements," in Shelley's sense of the word, are present, but whether they can be separated by analysis. Mr. Hoffman's demonstration, it must be frankly said, will not convince any reader who examines it critically. It proceeds on the assumption that a number of slight probabilities may constitute a virtual certainty, which is not true unless the probabilities tend in the same direction and support one another. "Perhaps," we are told, at a certain point Shelley was thinking of certain words used by Laertes in *Hamlet* (p. 54); a little later, a passage in Drummond's *Academical Questions* "may have had something to do with the behavior of Shelley's poet" (p. 55); an image in *The Excursion* "so exactly suits the situation of Shelley's poet that we can scarcely doubt its power of suggestion" (p. 71); "Odysseus and Æneas could hardly have failed to come into Shelley's mind when he sent his poet out on the ocean" (pp. 71-2); "the association of love which this story [of King Ceyx] had in Shelley's mind makes its connection with the voyage of Shelley's poet seem probable" (p. 73); "no one seems to have considered that since the poet's boat is deposited on the summit of a mountain, it bears a most striking resemblance to Noah's ark" (p. 81); "there can be little doubt" that a passage in Burnet's *Telluris Theoria Sacra* "helped to send the water of the ocean on its way through the cavern" (p. 85). When, as rarely happens, the evidence gains any appearance of strength from cumulative effect, the conjecture so reinforced is treated as established fact. On p. 68 Mr. Hoffman refers to the "divine Luxima," a character of Lady

Morgan's creation, "whose association with the scene . . . was so strong as to bring her into the poem." The only evidence for the statement consists of a short series of cautious observations with the usual qualifying phrases. It appears that "the presence . . . of the torrent may help to account for the fact that the voice of the veiled maiden" had certain qualities; that "eloquence . . . was another of Luxima's characteristics which, it would seem, contributed to the charms of the veiled maiden"; that "very likely the maiden owes something of her extraordinary animation to the beautiful Indian"; and that "the effects on the poet of his passion for the veiled maiden seem to have been largely inspired by the violent effects on the missionary of unjustifiably jealous love." A remark on p. 82 is open to a similar objection: "As we have seen, *The Adventures of Peter Wilkins* was most important in determining the cliffs and the yawning cavern." What we have actually seen, or been asked to consider, is Mr. Hoffman's opinion that "in all likelihood" such an influence was present.

"The chief debt I owe to critics of literature," said Sir Walter Raleigh, "is a debt of thankfulness for their quotations. You may have read the book from which the quotation is taken, but your mind glided off it; when you are presented with it afresh, in a new setting, it comes home to you as it never did before."¹ The reader who approaches Mr. Hoffmann's book in this spirit will incur a great debt, and will not complain if the quotations do not always fulfil their nominal purpose.

P. L. CARVER.

A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue. By Sir WILLIAM CRAIGIE. Part VI, Communalitie-Cow. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; London: H. Milford. 1936. Pp. 601-720. 21s. net.

PART VI of the new Scottish dictionary, covering as it does at least half the words beginning with *com* and all those beginning with *con*, is concerned very largely with learned words of Latin origin and a number of words of French origin, often of a technical character. There are very few which are either English or Scandinavian in origin and only some half dozen of Gaelic origin, the latter being highly specialized or technical terms. They include *connoch*, "murrain in cattle"; *conveth*, "entertainment due by a vassal

¹ *On Writing and Writers*, p. 171.

to his superior"; *corenoch*, "outcry, lament," more familiar to us in Scott's *coronach*, which is closer to the actual Gaelic form *coranach*, and the well-known topographical *corrie*.

The large proportion of words of Latin origin, whether learned or popular, is interesting in the way it illustrates the curiously irregular forms which many of these words take in Scottish on occasion. Latin or French scholarship in the matter of word-formation does not seem to have been very exact, and we have many strange forms, such as *companarie* for *company*, *comparalion* for *comparisoun* (itself a perversion of *caparison*), *compeditour* for *competitor*, *componitour* for *compositour*, *compterfute* for *counterfeit*, *comptir* for *contyr* (i.e. encounter), *conducend* for *condescend*, *contumation* for *contumacy*, *coram* for *corum* (itself a corruption of *quorum*), *corrowner* for *coronell* or *colonel*.

As was to be expected in a section so highly Latinized in its contents, we have a number of new words not hitherto recorded. Such as *componito(u)r*, apparently from Latin *componitur*, "it is settled" in the sense *compositioun*, "settlement"; *compulsatour*, a writ ordering the performance of some act"; *concumulat*, "piled together"; the new compound *conjunct-feare*, "married companion"; *conspeckell*, "conspicuous," the source of the dialectal *kenspeckle*; *consul* and *copule* for *counsel* and *couple*. Of new words of French origin we may note the curious *congédiate*, "dismiss"; *consergerie*, "house used as an inn by Scottish merchants at Campvere"; *contreth*, "country," from O.Fr. *contrede*; *coorie*, "stable," from Fr. *écurie*; *cordecedron*, *cordesideron*, "lemon peel," from Fr. *écorce de citron*.

Searching of early records, accounts, estate books, and the like has as usual enabled the editor to carry back the history of many words a good number of years. We may note *compt buke*, i.e. "account book" (130), *conduct*, for "safe-conduct" (50), *confect*, "comfit" (80), *connotar*, "co-notary" (60), *conseirge*, "custodian" (80), *constabulary* as a jurisdiction (130), as an office (70), the figures in brackets denoting the number of years.

In conclusion, one does not know which to admire most—the success of the editor in supplementing the work of the Oxford English Dictionary, so far as Scottish words are concerned, or the really remarkable way in which the editors of the Oxford Dictionary managed to include within their own dictionary so large a proportion of the rarer Scottish words.

ALLEN MAWER.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

ANGLIA, Band LXI, Heft 1/2, January 1937—

Das Verbum *wollen* im Altgermanischen (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Altenglischen) (H. M. Flasdieck), pp. 1-42.

Ae. *dōn* und *zān* (H. M. Flasdieck), pp. 43-64.

Sprachliche Studien zu Texten des MS. Cotton Galba E IX (B. von Lindheim), pp. 65-71.

Sailors' Pronunciation, 1770-1783 (W. Matthews), pp. 72-80.

Der [r]-Einschub nach me. *ā* in Neu-England (H. Penzl), pp. 81-92.

Gaelic Influence on Lowland Scottish (Elisabeth Westergaard), pp. 93-97.

Satzsinn und Tonfall (Modus der betonten Tatsächlichkeit und intensive Aktionsart im Ne.) (W. Schmidt), pp. 98-111.

Noun Clauses in *because* (E. E. Ericson), pp. 112-13.

Mid Moidum ic wæs (Kemp Malone), pp. 114-16.

Die Assoziation in *Deors Klage* (L. Forster), pp. 117-21.

Ein Bruchstück aus *Byrhtferps Handbuch* (H. Henel), pp. 122-25.

Reynard climbs (*Owl* 816) (B. J. Whiting), pp. 126-28.

Kleine Beiträge zu *Sir Gawain* (F. P. Magoun), pp. 129-35.

Chaucer und das Buch Senior (J. Ruska), pp. 136-37.

The Canon's Yeoman's Tale, ll. G. 1448-1463.

Kirchenlieder aus dem 15. Jahrhundert (K. Brunner), pp. 138-51.

Französischer Frühhumanismus in England (F. Brie), pp. 152-62.

Shakespeare's *Cressida* (H. Kenny), pp. 163-76.

King Lear (P. Fijn van Draat), pp. 177-85.

Supernatural Beings in Restoration Drama (T. B. Stroup), pp. 186-92.

Die Volksballaden von Tom dem Reimer (W. Schmidt), pp. 193-221.

Der Anlass zum Streit in der Edward-Ballade (W. Schmidt), pp. 222-24.

CORNHILL MAGAZINE, Vol. 154, November 1937—

William Tyndale (Helen Likeman), pp. 529-32.

— Vol. 155, January 1937—

Rudyard Kipling (Herbert Palmer), pp. 24-31.

DIALECT NOTES, Vol. VI, Parts XII, XIII, July-December, 1936—

An American Glossary [Put Through—Slang] (R. H. Thornten), pp. 529-76.

E.L.H., Vol. III, December 1936—

Boswell and Wilkes in Italy (R. Warnock), pp. 257-69.

Boswell's notes for a journal of his Italian tour.

Topographical Comedy in the Seventeenth Century (R. H. Perkinson), pp. 270-90.

Songs from Restoration Drama in Contemporary and Eighteenth-century Poetical Miscellanies (R. G. Noyes), pp. 291-316.

A catalogue of songs reprinted.

The Influence of Hall on Shakespeare's English Historical Plays (W. G. Zeeveld), pp. 317-53.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Band 71, Heft 2, December 1936—

The Hellebore in Anglo-Saxon Pharmacy (Erika von Erhardt-Siebold), pp. 161-70.

Die soziale Stellung der englischen Renaissancedramatiker (M. J. Wolff), pp. 171-90.

Christopher Smart (F. T. Wood), pp. 191-213.

Wertungsbedingte Lautwandlungen im Neuenglischen (H. Koziol), pp. 214-19.

The Expanded Tenses in Modern English. An Attempt at an Explanation (C. A. Bodelsen), pp. 220-38.

Practically. Eine Lücke in den englisch-deutschen Wörterbüchern (P. Lange), pp. 239-43.

Ne. *bask* (Royce West), pp. 316-18.

The Coalman's Cry (L. Forster), pp. 318-19.

Cockney pronunciation.

Happy End oder *Happy Ending*? (Torsten Dahl), p. 319.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XVIII, December 1936—

The Study of Anglo-Saxon in America (C. R. Thompson) pp. 241-53.

— Vol. XIX, February 1937—

The Antagonism of Forms in the Eighteenth Century (III) (B. Fehr), pp. 1-13.

Notes on *Coriolanus* (A. H. King), pp. 13-20.

Notes on Synchronic Grammar (C. E. Bazele), pp. 20-23.

Case in English.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES,¹ Vol. I, January 1937—

Creative Imagination (Charles Morgan), pp. 1-18.

¹ The *Revue Anglo-Américaine* has ceased publication.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 249

- Le Romantisme en France et en Angleterre : quelques différences
(L. Cazamian), pp. 19-35.
Rochester et sa réputation (P. Legouis), pp. 53-69.

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN, Band 170, 3 u. 4 Heft, December 1936—

- René und Harold (R. Kaiser), pp. 185-96.
Chateaubriand's influence on Byron.
Die Runeninschrift des Holzschwertes von Arum (H. Harder),
pp. 218-19.
Die Runeninschrift der Schnalle von Szabadbattyán (H. Harder),
pp. 219-21.
Zu Robert Brownings *A Grammarian's Funeral* (H. Koziol), pp.
227-29.

HUNTINGTON LIBRARY BULLETIN, Number 10, October 1936—

- Robert Aylett (F. M. Padelford), pp. 1-48.
Benjamin Franklin's Memoirs (Max Farrand), pp. 49-78.
The Censorship in the Case of Macklin's *The Man of the World*
(D. MacMillan), pp. 79-101.
Thomas Paine, Edward Nares, and Mrs. Piozzi's Marginalia (Marjorie
Nicolson), pp. 103-33.
William Blake, Painter (C. H. Collins Baker), pp. 135-48.
Letters of Charles Lever to his Wife and Daughter (F. P. Rolfe),
pp. 149-84.
Raleigh's "Even Such is Time" (Virgil B. Heltzel), pp. 185-88.
Relationship and date of the different versions.

LIBRARY, Vol. XVII, December 1936—

- Some Illustrators of *The Pilgrim's Progress* (Part One) : John Bunyan
(F. M. Harrison), pp. 241-63.
Additions to *Title-Page Borders* 1485-1640 (F. S. Ferguson), pp.
264-311.
The Price of Books in Medieval England (H. E. Bell), pp. 312-32.
Bibliographical Problems in Dekker's *Magnificent Entertainment*
(F. T. Bowers), pp. 333-39.
The Editions of the "Overburian" Characters (W. J. Paylor), pp.
340-48.
Edward Buckler (1610-1706), Poet and Preacher (W. H. Buckler),
pp. 349-53.
A Census of copies of William Blake's *Poetical Sketches*, 1783 (Mar-
garet R. Lowery), pp. 354-60.
The Lyf of our Lady (E. F. Bosanquet), pp. 362-63.
Reply to Dr. Bühler's note (September, pp. 155-66) ; cancels of the first
edition, not fragments of a second edition.

LIFE AND LETTERS TO-DAY, Vol. XV, Winter 1936-1937—

Mr. and Mrs. Browne of the Boar's Head (C. J. Sisson), pp. 99-107.

The Elizabethan inn-yard theatre and theatrical history.

Timon's Dog (W. Empson), pp. 108-15.

Shakespeare's imagery.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LI, December 1936—

Concerning the *Noctes Ambrosianæ* (A. L. Strout), pp. 493-504.

Charles Macklin's Lost Play about Henry Fielding (Esther M. Raushenbush), pp. 505-14.

MS. in the Larpent Collection at the Huntington Library.

Joseph Warton's Classification of English Poets (Hoyt Trowbridge), pp. 515-18.

Warton's revision suggested by criticism in *The Monthly Review*.

Jonson's *Ode on Morison* and Seneca's *Epistulae Morales* (John E. Hankins), pp. 518-20.

Borrowings from the ninety-third epistle.

Memorandums of the Immortal Ben (Mark Eccles), pp. 520-23.

From Lewis Theobald's *Censor*, 1715.

Calderon, Boursault, and Ravenscroft (H. C. Lancaster), pp. 523-28.

French literature as intermediary between Spanish and English.

"Bydding Base" (October 5) (S. A. Larrabee), pp. 535-36.

Reference by Spenser to contests in verse.

— Vol. LII, January 1937—

A New Lydgate-Chaucer Manuscript (C. F. Bühler), pp. 1-9.

Pierpont Morgan Library, MS. 4, containing *Siege of Thebes*, *Lenvoye to all prynces*, *Letter to Gloucester*, and Chaucer's *Compleynt vn-to his purse*; notes and variant readings.

Spring in Chaucer and Before Him (Rosemond Tuve), pp. 9-16.

Chaucer's use of tradition.

Chaucer at Work on the Complaint in the *Franklin's Tale* (Germaine Dempster), pp. 16-23.

A B Version of the Legend Told by Chaucer's Prioress (Woodburn O. Ross), pp. 23-25.

Old Age in Chaucer's Day (G. R. Coffman), pp. 25-26.

Pope Innocent's *De Contemptu Mundi* and *The Parlement of the Three Ages*.

On the Subtly Creeping Wine of Chaucer's Pardoner (A. L. Hench), pp. 27-28.

Similar charge recorded in the Shillingford Papers.

A Thirteenth-Century Chaucerian Analogue (Beatrice D. Brown), pp. 28-31.

In the *Dialogus Miraculorum* of Cæsarius of Heisterbach.

An Uncollected Sixteenth-Century Allusion to *The House of Fame* (H. C. Whitford), pp. 31-32.

In a speech by Chief Justice Robert Catlin, 1571.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 251

Sir Lewis Clifford's French Mission of 1391 (Haldeen Braddy), pp. 33-34.
French official record.

A Note on the Helm in *Beowulf* (S. J. Herben, Jr.), pp. 34-36.
Evidence of Valsgärde grave-finds.

"Brow" or "Brawn"? (H. L. Savage), pp. 36-38.
Note on *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, l. 1457.

Bandello and "Clizia" (Olin H. Moore), pp. 38-44.
Versions of the story of Romeo and Juliet.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LII, February—

Shakespeare's "Lay Her A-Hold" (H. B. Allen), pp. 96-100.
For "a-hull"?

A Note on *I Tamburlane*, I. ii. 242-43 (L. J. Mills), pp. 101-03.
A recollection of Lucian's *Toxaris*?

Thomas Deloney: Two Notes (G. W. Kuehn), pp. 103-05.
A Complaint of the Yeoman Weavers; early editions of the novels.

The Relation of Drayton's *Noah's Flood* to the Ordinary Learning of the Early Seventeenth Century (D. C. Allen), pp. 106-11.

Dryden and Eton (P. Legouis), pp. 111-15.
Reference in Settle's *Absalom Senior*.

Dryden and All Souls (J. A. W. Bennett), pp. 115-16.
Confirmation of Dryden's candidature for the wardenship.

The Matchless Orinda (R. K. Alspach), pp. 116-17.
Disparaging reference in Newcomb's *Bibliotheca*, 1712.

The Word "Anachronism" (H. L. Ebeling), pp. 120-21.
Modern currency due to Scaliger.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXXII, January 1937—

The Date of Æthelred's Treaty with the Vikings: Olaf and the Battle of Maldon (E. V. Gordon), pp. 24-32.

994, not 991; interpretation of the treaty; evidence against Olaf's presence

The Chronology of Middleton's Plays (R. C. Bald), pp. 33-43.

A Note on *Crist*, Line 20 (S. K. Das), pp. 79-80.

Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, Line 2511 (L. M. Perry), pp. 80-81.

An Unrecognized Edition of Nicholas Breton (F. B. Williams, Jr.), pp. 81-82.

Fragment in the Cambridge University Library.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXIV, November 1936—

The Wægmundings—Swedes or Geats? (W. F. Bryan), pp. 113-18.
A Geatish family.

The Poetry of Johannes Beverus with Extracts from his *Tractatus de Bruto abbreviato* (J. Hammer), pp. 119-32.

A condensed version of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*.

On the Source of the Deception Story in the *Merchant's Tale* (Germaine Dempster), pp. 133-54.

The Idea of Decline in Literature and the Fine Arts in Eighteenth-Century England (J. D. Scheffer), pp. 155-78.

William Huggins and Tobias Smollett (L. F. Powell), pp. 179-92.

Huggins' reply to Warton's *Observations on the Faerie Queene*; correspondence with Smollett.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Vol. 22, Part 2—

Die geistes geschichtliche und die literarische Nachfolge der Neu-Atlantis des Francis Bacon, I (H. Minkowski), pp. 120-39.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 171, October 31, 1936—

A Third Thousand Notes on *N. E. D.* (G. G. Loane), pp. 309-11.

Earlier examples, and words and senses not given; continued November 14, pp. 348-50; November 28, pp. 381-82; December 12, pp. 417-18; December 26, pp. 452-54; January 9, pp. 24-26; January 23, pp. 60-61. Note by W. W. Gill, November 28, p. 395.

— November 7—

Milton and Thomas Brown's Translation of Gelli (B. Boyce), pp. 328-29.

Miltonic rendering of hymn in Book 9.

— November 14—

The Anatomy of the *Bab Ballads* (J. M. Bulloch), pp. 344-48.

Further note, November 28, p. 385.

— November 21—

The Origins of the Skeltonic (Fitzroy Pyle), pp. 362-4.

Dalilah (Hibernicus), pp. 366-67.

Milton's pronunciation.

— November 28—

Allusions in Byron's Letters (R. G. Howarth), p. 388.

Continuation, giving sources of other allusions, December 5, pp. 401-03.

Replies by Edward Bensly, December 12, p. 424; by Hibernicus, December 19, p. 446; by R. G. Howarth, December 26, pp. 462-63.

Some Notes on Wither (Hibernicus), p. 404

— December 5—

"The Fatal Bellman" (J. E. Morris), pp. 404-05.

Reference to Dowe's gift to St. Sepulchre's, 1605? Notes by Edward Bensly, December 19, p. 443; by C. A. Bradford, December 26, p. 457.

— December 12—

A Contemporary Comment on Dr. Johnson (Marion H. Addington), pp. 418-19.

In the *Royal Chronicle*, January 1762.

— December 19—

W. S. Gilbert's Father (J. M. Bulloch), pp. 435-39.

The man and his writings.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 253

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 171, December 26—

Chaucer's *Truth* Modernised, 1756 (Claude Jones), p. 455.

Version in the *Universal Visiter and Memorialist*.

— Vol. 172, January 2, 1937—

The Vulgar Speech of London in the XV-XVII Centuries (W. Matthews), pp. 2-5.

Continued January 9, pp. 21-24; January 16, pp. 40-42; January 23, pp. 56-58; January 30, pp. 77-79.

Chapman and Holofernes (G. G. L.), p. 7.

Chapman's pronunciation of "debt."

— January 16—

Unrecorded Eighteenth-Century Plays (F. T. Wood), p. 43.

Additions to former lists.

Cassio the Puritan (Enid Glen), pp. 43-44.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. XV, October 1936—

Senecan Style in the Seventeenth Century (G. Williamson), pp.

321-51.

Seneca's influence on English prose.

More about the Prince Hal Legend (D. T. Starnes), pp. 358-66.

Versions by Angel Day, John Case and Barnabe Barnes.

Two Poems from the "Booke of John Lucas" (W. J. Wager), pp.

377-83.

Authorship of verses attributed to Lydgate.

Walpole and a Dublin Pirate (R. H. Perkinson), pp. 391-400.

Dublin edition of *The Mysterious Mother*; changes in Walpole's attitude to his play.

That Monster Custom (S. A. Tannenbaum), pp. 401-05.

Suggested emendation of *Hamlet*, III. iv. 161.

Manuscripts of Thomson's Poems to Amanda and Elegy on Aikman

(J. E. Wells), pp. 405-08.

In the Edinburgh University Library.

Patronage of Joseph Hall and John Donne (Florence S. Teager),

pp. 408-13.

Sir Robert Drury's financial position.

Spenser's Talus Again (V. B. Hulbert), p. 413.

Note on Professor Draper's article.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,

Vol. LI, December 1936—

The Influence of Superstition on Vocabulary (Hope E. Allen), pp.

904-20.

English Legal Proverbs (D. F. Bond), pp. 921-35

Thomas Vaughan's Influence upon the Poetry of Henry Vaughan

(R. M. Wardle), pp. 936-52.

- Oroonoko* in France in the Eighteenth Century (E. D. Seeber), pp. 953-59.
 William Shenstone's Share in the Preparation of Percy's *Reliques* (I. L. Churchill), pp. 960-74.
 Some New Burns Letters (DeLancey Ferguson), pp. 975-84.
 Additions to and corrections of Mr. Ferguson's edition.
 Unpublished Marginalia in Coleridge's Copy of Malthus's *Essay on Population* (G. R. Potter), pp. 1061-68.
 The Symbolism of the Wind and the Leaves in Shelley's *Ode to the West Wind* (I. J. Kapstein), pp. 1069-79.
 The Meaning of *Hyperion* (J. R. Caldwell), pp. 1080-97.
 Moneta's Temple (J. L. Lowes), pp. 1098-1113.
 Interweaving of themes from Greece, Judea, Egypt, Staffa, and the Mount of Purgatory.
 Longfellow in England: Unpublished Extracts from His Journal (S. T. Richards), pp. 1123-40.
 Meetings with Carlyle, Lockhart, Leigh Hunt and others.
- STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXIV, January 1937—
 Chaucer's Aphorisms from Ptolemy (Karl Young), pp. 1-7.
 Gerard's preface to the *Almagest* in a fourteenth-century MS.
 The Man of Law's Head-Link and the Prologue of the Canterbury Tales (Carleton Brown), pp. 8-35.
 Chaucer's revisions and re-arrangements.
 A Late Fifteenth-Century Revision of Mirk's *Festial* (Lillian L. Steckman), pp. 36-48.
 French *Aumusse*, English *Amice* (G. C. S. Adams), pp. 49-51.
 Notes on form and meaning.
 Byron and English Interest in the Near East (W. C. Brown), pp. 55-64.
- TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, November 7, 1936—
 Dates of Housman Poems (Sydney Cockerell), p. 908.
 Dates of *Last Poems* as dictated by Housman in 1922.
 Surrey's Vocabulary (L. F. Casson), p. 908.
 Note on *feddrame*.
 Harriot and the "School of Night" (Frances A. Yates), p. 908.
 Harriot MSS. in the British Museum and elsewhere.
 Perttaunt (J. Dover Wilson), p. 908.
 Reply to earlier letters.
 "Cancels in Percy's *Reliques*" (L. F. Powell), p. 908.
 The suppression of "The Jolly Beggars."
-
- November 14—
 Sir James Fitzjames Stephen (F. Brompton Harvey), p. 928.
Essays by a Barrister, 1862, and Stephen's own marginal notes.
 More of the *Ormulum* (N. R. Ker), p. 928.
 Extracts in a Lambeth manuscript, some from leaves now missing.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, November 21—

Two Victorian Humourists: Burnand and the Mask of Gilbert,
pp. 935-36.

The Vision of Jupiter in *Cymbeline* (G. Wilson Knight), p. 958.

A Greene Quarto (Evelyn Simpson), p. 980.

Perfect copy of 1594 quarto of *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* in Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

"Miscellany" Tottell (Florence E. Dyer), p. 980.

References connecting William Tottell with Wiston in 1587-89.

November 28—

Was Lady Bedford the Phoenix (B. H. Newdigate), p. 996.

Lady Bedford's own copy of *The Fountaine of Selfe-Love*, with special dedication. Note by W. B. Kempling, December 5, p. 1016.

Bernard Mandeville (P. B. Anderson), p. 996.

Contributions to *The Weekly Journal*.

Spenser's "Stony Aubrian" (Pauline Henley), p. 996.

The Bray-Dargle River?

A Cause of Corruption? (G. G. Loane), p. 996.

Misprints involving interchange of letters.

December 5—

"Pupilla" and "Babe" (Katharine Garvin), p. 1016.

Possible origin of the phrase "looking babies."

De Quincey and a Murderer's Conscience (R. H. Super), p. 1016.

Origin of incident in the essay *On Murder*.

A Poem by Cowley (G. Walton), p. 1016.

Commendatory verse on *The Purple Island*.

Feminine Endings in Milton's Blank Verse (J. C. Smith), p. 1016.

A sign of agitation in the speaker?

December 12—

The Invisible College (1645-1660) (R. Fitzgibbon Young), p. 1035.

Contemporary connotation and associations of the term.

Bowman v. Donne (J. Milton French), p. 1035.

The printing of Donne's sermons.

"Loving Ballad of Lord Bateman" (M. L. Parrish), p. 1035.

Proof copy with corrections by Cruikshank.

Another Pamela (C. H.), p. 1035.

Parallel in letter of 1789 to Miss Heber.

December 19—

A Skelton Emendation (H. L. R. Edwards), p. 1052.

In the Latin verses at the end of *Colin Clout*.

Deloney and Gilds (G. W. Kuehn), p. 1052.

Historical background of the novels.

"As from the darkening gloom . . ." (H. W. Garrod), p. 1052.

Date of Keats' sonnet.

Milton's Library (Maurice Kelley), p. 1056.

Questioning the authenticity of signatures claimed as Milton's by Mr. Kenneth Cameron.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, December 26—

The Ingoldsby Legends: "Mirth and Marvels" from St. Paul's, pp. 1057-58.

Some Romany Words (Eric Partridge), p. 1068.

Note on the derivation of "tanner" by J. Leveen, January 2, p. 12.

— January 2, 1937—

Huntsmen of Renown: On the track of the models of Surtees (Alan Fox-Hutchinson), p. 10.

Marlowe and his Father (John Bakeless), p. 12.

References in the Harriot papers in the British Museum and in Canterbury archives.

Milton's Harapha (W. R. Parker), p. 12.

Definitions in Edward Philips' *New World of Words* as commentary on Milton. Notes by E. N. Adler, January 16, p. 44; by J. Leveen and H. Loewe, January 23, p. 60.

— January 9—

Humanism in Oxford (R. Weiss), p. 28.

Stephanus Surigonus in Oxford sometime between 1454 and 1471.

Hamlet Problems (H. D. Gray), p. 28.

Reply to Professor Dover Wilson.

Adelaide O'Keefe (R. W. Babcock), p. 28.

Letters with reference to her father's *Recollections*. Note by M. J. MacManus, January 23, p. 60.

Milton and Harrington (G. M. Young), p. 28.

A possible echo of Harrington in *Samson*. Note, suggesting further echo in Congreve, by J. Dover Wilson, January 16, p. 44; by G. G. Loane, January 23, p. 60.

— January 16—

Gascoigne and Hatton (E. St. John Brooks), p. 44.

Hatton pilloried in *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*?

"The prenzie Angelo" (W. P. Barrett), p. 44.

For "peregrin"?

"La Donna del Lago" (W. M. Parker), p. 48.

Italian translation by Pallavicini. Note by E. R. Vincent, January 23, p. 64.

— January 23—

Holcroft's German (V. R. Stallbaumer), p. 60.

Evidence that he translated Lavater direct, not through French.

— January 30—

Dekker's Theatrical Allusiveness (W. J. Lawrence), p. 72.

Allusions to other plays as evidence of date.

Sir Thomas More's Verse Rhythms (Fitzroy Pyle), p. 76.

n's by Mr.

Paul's, pp.

p. 12.

rtees (Alan

Canterbury

umentary on
veen and H.

471.

M. J. Mac-

further echo
G. Loane,

ary 23, p. 64.

n.